arXiv:math/0412061v3 [math.OA] 14 Sep 2005

EXTENSION OF THE STRUCTURE THEOREM OF BORCHERS AND ITS APPLICATION TO HALF-SIDED MODULAR INCLUSIONS

HUZIHIRO ARAKI AND LÁSZLÓ ZSIDÓ

Dedicated to Professor D. Buchholz on his 60^{th} *birthday*

Abstract. A result of H.-W. Wiesbrock is extended from the case of a common cyclic and separating vector for the half-sided modular inclusion $N \subset M$ of von Neumann algebras to the case of a common faithful normal semifinite weight and at the same time a gap in Wiesbrock's proof is filled in.

1. Introduction

J. Bisognano and E. Wichmann ([4]) made a discovery about the connection of the modular operator and the modular conjugation for the von Neumann algebra generated by quantum fields in a wedge region of the Minkowski space-time with kinematical transformations, namely pure Lorentz transformation and the TCP_1 operator.

H. J. Borchers ([6]) formulates an important feature of this connection in the abstract setting of a pair of von Neumann algebras $N \subset M$ with a common cyclic and separating vector Ω, and a one-parameter group of unitaries $U(\lambda)$ having a positive generator, which induces a semigroup of endomorphisms of (M, Ω), obtaining a commutation relation of $U(\lambda)$ with the modular operator and the modular conjugation for (M, Ω), which reproduces the kinematical commutation relations in the Bisognano-Wichmann situation.

A further development has been achieved by H.-W. Wiesbrock ([37], [38], [39], [40], [41], [42]), who introduces the notion of the half-sided modular inclusion and obtains an underlying group structure (cf. [31]), as well as an imbedding of the canonical endomorphisms of the subfactor theory into a one-parameter semigroup of endomorphisms in this specific situation. Thus he gets a correspondence between 2-dimensional chiral conformal field theories and a class of type III_1 subfactors.

Unfortunately, there is a gap in Wiesbrock's proof of his basic theorem ([37], Theorem 3, Corollary 6 and Corollary 7, [42]). We will fill in this gap in Wiesbrock's proof and further generalize the result to the case of a common normal semifinite faithful weight.

Date: November 7, 2004.

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 81T40, 46L10.

Key words and phrases. von Neumann algebra, modular theory, half-sided modular inclusion, analytic extension of one-parameter groups.

The second author was supported by MIUR, INDAM and EU.

As a basic tool to prove general half-sided modular inclusion results, we generalize a structure theorem of H. J. Borchers ([7], Theorem B) considerably, making Borchers' proof at the same time more transparent.

The extension from the state case to the weights turns out to be not straightforward. For this purpose we introduce as a basic tool the notion of a Hermitian map by using modular structure.

It seems that before the summer of 1995, when we independently noticed the gap in the proof of Wiesbrock's half-sided modular inclusion theorem, this gap was generally overlooked. Thanks to Prof. Detlev Buchholz, who has been visiting the first named author in the fall of 1995, we learned about each others insights and started to collaborate on this paper. The first version of the paper, containing a complete proof of the General Half-sided Modular Inclusion Theorem, Theorem 2.1, was available already at the end of 1995. It had a restricted circulation, but it was presented at several conferences. Other topics, like Theorem 2.2 on the structure and type of the involved von Neumann algebras and Proposition 2.4 on pathologies of the analytic extension of orbits of one-parameter automorphism groups, are of more recent date.

We notice that since 1995 a number of papers appeared, containing proposals for a complete proof of the half-sided modular inclusion theorem (see, for example, [17], Section 3 and [10], pp. 608 and 609). None the less, till now we have no knowledge of a completely elaborated proof, even in the state case.

2. MAIN RESULTS

(a) NOTATIONS AND FACTS FROM THE MODULAR THEORY OF VON NEUMANN ALGEBRAS (see, for example, [35], Chapter 10).

For two Hilbert spaces H and K we denote by $B(K,H)$ the Banach space of all bounded linear maps from K to H. $B(H,H)$ will be denoted simply by $B(H)$. If T is a not necessarily everywhere defined linear operator from K to H, then $\mathrm{Dom}\,(T)$ will stand for the domain of T.

We denote the weak and the strong operator topology on $B(K,H)$ respectively by wo and so. The weak topology defined on $B(K,H)$ by all linear functionals belonging to the norm-closure of the wo-continuous linear functionals in the dual of $B(K,H)$ will be denoted by w. Further, the locally convex vector space topology defined on $B(K,H)$ by the seminorms

$$B(K,H) \ni T \longmapsto \varphi(T^*T)^{1/2}\,,$$

where φ ranges over all w-continuous positive linear functionals on $B(K)$, will be denoted by s. We notice that on any bounded subset of $B(K,H)$ $wo = w$ and $so = s$.

For a weight φ on a von Neumann algebra M we use the standard notations:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{N}_\varphi &= \{x \in M\,;\, \varphi(x^*x) < +\infty\} \ \text{(left ideal)}\,,\\ \mathfrak{M}_\varphi &= (\mathfrak{N}_\varphi)^*\mathfrak{N}_\varphi = \text{ the linear span of} \{a \in M^+\,;\, \varphi(a) < +\infty\}\\ &\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad \text{(hereditary $*$-subalgebra)}\,,\\ \mathfrak{A}_\varphi &= (\mathfrak{N}_\varphi)^* \cap \mathfrak{N}_\varphi \supset \mathfrak{M}_\varphi \qquad\quad \text{($*$-subalgebra)}\,. \end{aligned}$$

We notice that for $a \in M^+$ we have $a \in \mathfrak{M}_\varphi \iff \varphi(a) < +\infty$.

A von Neumann algebra M on a Hilbert space H is in *standard form with respect to a normal semifinite faithful weight* φ on M if there is a linear map with dense range

$$\mathfrak{N}_\varphi \ni x \longmapsto x_\varphi \in H$$

such that

$$\varphi(x^*x) = \|x_\varphi\|^2 \,,\ (a\,x)_\varphi = a\,x_\varphi \,, \qquad x \in \mathfrak{N}_\varphi \,,\ a \in M \,.$$

In particular, by the faithfulness of φ, the map $x \longmapsto x_\varphi$ is injective. We notice also that the above map $x \longmapsto x_\varphi$ is unique up to natural unitary equivalence. If φ is bounded, then $\xi_\varphi = (1_H)_\varphi$ is a cyclic and separating vector for M and $x_\varphi = x\,\xi_\varphi$ for all $x \in M = \mathfrak{N}_\varphi$. In this case φ is the vector form $M \ni x \longmapsto \omega_{\xi_\varphi}(x) = (x\,\xi_\varphi \,|\, \xi_\varphi)$.

Let M be a von Neumann algebra on a Hilbert space H, in standard form with respect to a normal semifinite faithful weight φ on M. Then the antilinear operator

$$H \supset \{x_\varphi \,;\, x \in \mathfrak{A}_\varphi\} \ni x_\varphi \longmapsto (x^*)_\varphi$$

has closure S_φ and the invertible positive selfadjoint operator $\Delta_\varphi = S_\varphi^* S_\varphi$ is called the *modular operator* of φ. If

$$S_\varphi = J_\varphi\,\Delta_\varphi^{1/2}$$

is the polar decomposition of S_φ, then J_φ is an involutive antiunitary operator (antilinear surjective isometry with $J_\varphi^2 = 1_H$), called the *modular conjugation* of φ. The operators Δ_φ and J_φ satisfy the commutation relation

$$J_\varphi\,\Delta_\varphi^z = \Delta_\varphi^{-\overline{z}}\,J_\varphi \,, \qquad z \in \mathbb{C} \,, \tag{2.1}$$

in particular,

$$S_\varphi = J_\varphi\,\Delta_\varphi^{1/2} = \Delta_\varphi^{-1/2}\,J_\varphi \,, \qquad J_\varphi\,\Delta_\varphi^{it} = \Delta_\varphi^{it}\,J_\varphi \,,\ t \in \mathbb{R} \,. \tag{2.2}$$

If φ is bounded and $\xi_\varphi = (1_H)_\varphi$ is the associated cyclic and separating vector, then

$$S_\varphi\,\xi_\varphi = \xi_\varphi \,, \quad \Delta_\varphi\,\xi_\varphi = \xi_\varphi \,, \quad J_\varphi\,\xi_\varphi = \xi_\varphi \,.$$

The fundamental result of the modular theory claims that

$$x \in \mathfrak{N}_\varphi \,,\ t \in \mathbb{R} \implies \Delta_\varphi^{it}\,x\,\Delta_\varphi^{-it} \in \mathfrak{N}_\varphi \,,\ (\Delta_\varphi^{it}\,x\,\Delta_\varphi^{-it})_\varphi = \Delta_\varphi^{it}\,x_\varphi \,, \tag{2.3}$$

so that

$$M \ni x \longmapsto \sigma_t^\varphi(x) = \Delta_\varphi^{it}\,x\,\Delta_\varphi^{-it} \in M \,, \qquad t \in \mathbb{R} \tag{2.4}$$

defines an *so*-continuous one-parameter group of automorphisms $(\sigma_t^\varphi)_{t\in\mathbb{R}}$ of M, called the *modular automorphism group* of φ, and

$$J_\varphi\,M\,J_\varphi = M' \,, \qquad x \,,\, y \in \mathfrak{N}_\varphi \implies x\,J_\varphi\,y_\varphi = J_\varphi\,y\,J_\varphi\,x_\varphi \,, \tag{2.5}$$

so that $M \ni x \longmapsto J_\varphi\,x^*J_\varphi \in M'$ is a $*$-antiisomorphism. Moreover, the weight φ is invariant under the action of the modular automorphism group :

$$\varphi\big(\sigma_t^\varphi(a)\big) = \varphi(a) \,, \qquad a \in M^+ \,,\ t \in \mathbb{R} \,. \tag{2.6}$$

The center $Z(M)$ of M is contained in the fixed point von Neumann subalgebra $\{x \in M \,;\, \sigma_t^\varphi(x) = x \,,\ t \in \mathbb{R}\} \subset M$, which is usually denoted by M^φ. On the other hand, $J_\varphi\,z\,J_\varphi = z^*$ for all $z \in Z(M)$. We recall also (see the proof of [28], Lemma 5.2 or [45], Corollary 1.2) :

$$x \in \mathfrak{N}_\varphi \,,\ y \in M^\varphi \implies x\,y \in \mathfrak{N}_\varphi \,,\ (x\,y)_\varphi = J_\varphi\,y^*J_\varphi\,x_\varphi \,. \tag{2.7}$$

Let $e \in M^\varphi$ be a projection and let φ_e denote the restriction of φ to eMe. By [28], Proposition 4.1 and Theorem 4.6 (see also [33], Propositions 4.5 and 4.7), φ_e

is a normal semifinite faithful weight and its modular group is the restriction of the modular group of φ to eMe. Thus, if $\pi_e : eMe \longrightarrow B(eH)$ is the faithful normal $*$-representation which associates to every $x \in eMe$ the restriction $x \,|\, eH$ considered as a linear operator $eH \to eH$, then the modular group of the weight $\varphi_e \circ \pi_e^{-1}$ on $\pi_e(eMe)$, that is $(\pi_e \circ \sigma_t^{\varphi_e} \circ \pi_e^{-1})_{t\in\mathbb{R}}$, is implemented by the unitary group $(\Delta_\varphi^{it} \,|\, eH)_{t\in\mathbb{R}}$ on eH. Nevertheless, $\pi_e(eMe)$ is not always in standard form with respect to $\varphi_e \circ \pi_e^{-1}$ (indeed, if $M \subset B(\mathbb{C}^4)$ is a type I_2 factor, in standard form with respect to its trace, and $e \in M$ is a minimal projection, then $\pi_e(M)$ is one-dimensional, while its commutant $\pi_e(M)'$ is four-dimensional, so $\pi_e(M)$ and $\pi_e(M)'$ are not antiisomorphic).

However, for any projection $e \in M^\varphi$,

$$\pi = \pi_{eJ_\varphi eJ_\varphi} : eMe \ni x \longmapsto x \,|\, eJ_\varphi eJ_\varphi H \in B(eJ_\varphi eJ_\varphi H) \tag{2.8}$$

is a faithful normal $*$-representation, such that the von Neumann algebra $\pi(eMe)$ is in standard form with respect to $\varphi_e \circ \pi^{-1}$ (cf. [19], Lemma 2.6). Moreover, Δ_φ and J_φ commute with $eJ_\varphi eJ_\varphi$ and we have the identifications

$$\Delta_{\varphi_e\circ\pi^{-1}} = \Delta_\varphi \,|\, eJ_\varphi eJ_\varphi H\,, \qquad J_{\varphi_e\circ\pi^{-1}} = J_\varphi \,|\, eJ_\varphi eJ_\varphi H\,. \tag{2.9}$$

For the convenience of the reader, let us outline the proof of (2.9).

For the faithfulness of π, let $x \in eMe$ be such that $x\, eJ_\varphi eJ_\varphi = 0$. Then

$$x\, J_\varphi MeJ_\varphi = x\, eJ_\varphi MJ_\varphi J_\varphi eJ_\varphi = J_\varphi MJ_\varphi\, x\, eJ_\varphi eJ_\varphi = 0\,,$$

so $x\, J_\varphi$ vanishes on MeH, hence on the range of the central support $z(e) \in Z(M)$ of e. Thus $x = x\, z(e) = x\, J_\varphi z(e) J_\varphi = 0$.

To see that $\pi(eMe)$ is in standard form with respect to $\psi = \varphi_e \circ \pi^{-1}$, first we notice that, according to (2.7), $\mathfrak{N}_\psi = \pi(\mathfrak{N}_{\varphi_e}) = e\,\mathfrak{N}_\varphi e$. Next, the linear map

$$\mathfrak{N}_\psi = \pi(\mathfrak{N}_{\varphi_e}) \ni \pi(x) \longmapsto x_\varphi = (exe)_\varphi \overset{(2.7)}{=} eJ_\varphi eJ_\varphi\, x_\varphi \in eJ_\varphi eJ_\varphi H$$

has dense range. Indeed, every vector in $eJ_\varphi eJ_\varphi H$ belongs to the closure of

$$eJ_\varphi eJ_\varphi \{x_\varphi \,;\, x \in \mathfrak{N}_\varphi\} \overset{(2.7)}{=} \{(exe)_\varphi \,;\, x \in \mathfrak{N}_\varphi\} = \{x_\varphi \,;\, x \in \mathfrak{N}_{\varphi_e}\}\,.$$

Finally, for every $\pi(x) \in \pi(\mathfrak{N}_{\varphi_e}) = \mathfrak{N}_\psi$ and $\pi(a) \in \pi(e\,M\,e)$ hold true:

$$\psi\big(\pi(x)^*\pi(x)\big) = \varphi_e(x^*x) = \varphi(x^*x) = \|x_\varphi\|^2\,, \qquad (a\,x)_\varphi = a\,x_\varphi = \pi(a)x_\varphi\,.$$

The commutation of J_φ with $eJ_\varphi eJ_\varphi$ follows immediately from the commutation of e with $J_\varphi eJ_\varphi$. Let J_e denote the involutive antiunitary operator

$$eJ_\varphi eJ_\varphi H \ni \xi \longmapsto J_\varphi\, \xi \in eJ_\varphi eJ_\varphi H\,.$$

Further, using (2.2) and $e \in M^\varphi$, we obtain for every $t \in \mathbb{R}$:

$$eJ_\varphi eJ_\varphi\, \Delta_\varphi^{it} = eJ_\varphi e\, \Delta_\varphi^{it} J_\varphi = eJ_\varphi\, \Delta_\varphi^{it} eJ_\varphi = e\, \Delta_\varphi^{it} J_\varphi eJ_\varphi = \Delta_\varphi^{it} eJ_\varphi eJ_\varphi\,.$$

Thus also Δ_φ commutes with $eJ_\varphi eJ_\varphi$, so

$$eJ_\varphi eJ_\varphi H \supset \mathrm{Dom}\,(\Delta_\varphi) \cap (eJ_\varphi eJ_\varphi H) \ni \xi \longmapsto \Delta_\varphi\, \xi \in eJ_\varphi eJ_\varphi H$$

is an invertible positive selfadjoint operator Δ_e, whose positive selfadjoint square root is

$$eJ_\varphi eJ_\varphi H \supset \mathrm{Dom}\,(\Delta_\varphi^{1/2}) \cap (eJ_\varphi eJ_\varphi H) \ni \xi \longmapsto \Delta_\varphi^{1/2}\, \xi \in eJ_\varphi eJ_\varphi H\,.$$

Since, for every $\pi(x) \in \pi(\mathfrak{A}_{\varphi_e}) = \mathfrak{A}_\psi$,

$$S_\psi x_\varphi = (x^*)_\varphi = S_\varphi x_\varphi = J_\varphi\, \Delta_\varphi^{1/2} x_\varphi = J_e\, \Delta_\varphi^{1/2} x_\varphi = J_e\, \Delta_e^{1/2} x_\varphi\,,$$

we deduce that $S_\psi \subset J_e\,\Delta_e^{1/2}$. For the equality $S_\psi = J_e\,\Delta_e^{1/2}$, which will imply (2.9), let $\xi \in \operatorname{Dom}(\Delta_e^{1/2}) = \operatorname{Dom}(\Delta_\varphi^{1/2}) \cap (eJ_\varphi eJ_\varphi H) = \operatorname{Dom}(S_\varphi) \cap (eJ_\varphi eJ_\varphi H)$ be arbitrary. Then there is a sequence $(x_n)_{n\geq 1}$ in $\mathfrak{A}_\varphi$ such that $(x_n)_\varphi \longrightarrow \xi$ and $(x_n^*)_\varphi \longrightarrow S_\varphi\,\xi$. By (2.7) the sequence $(ex_ne)_{n\geq 1}$ belongs to $\mathfrak{A}_{\varphi_e}$ and we have

$$(ex_ne)_\varphi = eJ_\varphi eJ_\varphi\,(x_n)_\varphi \longrightarrow eJ_\varphi eJ_\varphi\,\xi = \xi\,,$$
$$S_\psi\,(ex_ne)_\varphi = \big((ex_ne)^*\big)_\varphi = eJ_\varphi eJ_\varphi\,(x_n^*)_\varphi \longrightarrow eJ_\varphi eJ_\varphi\,S_\varphi\,\xi\,.$$

Now the closedness of the graph of S_ψ yields $\xi \in \operatorname{Dom}(S_\psi)$.

For a projection $p \in Z(M) \subset M^\varphi$ we have $J_\varphi pJ_\varphi = p$, so (2.9) yields

$$\Delta_{\varphi_p\circ\pi_p^{-1}} = \Delta_\varphi\,|\,pH\,, \qquad J_{\varphi_p\circ\pi_p^{-1}} = J_\varphi\,|\,pH\,. \tag{2.10}$$

Let $M \neq \{0\}$ be a von Neumann algebra, in standard form with respect to a normal semifinite faithful weight φ on M . Then the *Connes spectrum* $\Gamma(\sigma^\varphi)$ of the modular automorphism group σ^φ of φ is the intersection of the Arveson spectra of all modular automorphism groups σ^{φ_e}, where e ranges over all non-zero projections $e \in M^\varphi$. By [13], Lemme 1.2.2 and Théorème 2.2.4 (see also [33], Theorem 3.1 and Proposition 16.3), $\Gamma(\sigma^\varphi)$ is a closed additive subgroup of $\mathbb{R}$ and it does not depend on the choice of φ , so it can be denoted (like in [27], 8.15) by $\Gamma(M)$. Furthermore, by [13], Lemme 3.2.2 (see also [33], Proposition 28.1), $\lambda \in \Gamma(M)$ if and only if e^λ belongs to the spectrum $\sigma(\Delta_{\varphi_e})$ of Δ_{φ_e} for all non-zero projections $e \in M^\varphi$.

According to [13], page 28, the von Neumann algebra $M \neq \{0\}$ is called to be *of type* III$_1$ if $\Gamma(M) = \mathbb{R}$, or equivalently, if $\sigma(\Delta_{\varphi_e}) = [\,0,+\infty)$ for every non-zero projection $e \in M^\varphi$. By (2.9) we have also:

$$M \text{ is of type III}_1 \iff \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \sigma\big(\,\Delta_\varphi\,|\,eJ_\varphi eJ_\varphi H\,\big) = [\,0,+\infty) \\ \text{for every projection } 0 \neq e \in M^\varphi \end{array} \right. . \tag{2.11}$$

(b) The general Half-sided Modular Inclusion Theorem.

Let M be a von Neumann algebra on a Hilbert space H , in standard form with respect to a normal semifinite faithful weight φ on M . Let further $N \subset M$ be a von Neumann subalgebra such that the restriction ψ of φ to N is semifinite. If $\{y_\varphi\,;\,y \in \mathfrak{N}_\psi\}$ is dense in H , then N is in standard form with respect to ψ such that $y_\psi = y_\varphi$ for all $y \in \mathfrak{N}_\psi$. This happens, for example, if $N \subset M \subset B(H)$ are von Neumann algebras having a common cyclic and separating vector ξ_o , and φ is the vector form $M \ni x \longmapsto (x\,\xi_o\,|\,\xi_o)$.

In the above situation, owing to (2.5), we have

$$J_\psi\,J_\varphi\,M\,J_\varphi\,J_\psi = J_\psi\,M'\,J_\psi \subset J_\psi\,N'\,J_\psi = N\,,$$

so the unitary $J_\psi\,J_\varphi$ implements a unital $*$-homomorphism

$$M \ni x \longmapsto \operatorname{Ad}(J_\psi\,J_\varphi)(x) = J_\psi\,J_\varphi\,x\,J_\varphi\,J_\psi \in N \subset M\,,$$

considered by R. Longo ([24], [25]) and called the *canonical endomorphism* of the inclusion $N \subset M$. The canonical endomorphism γ , in particular the tunnel

$$M \supset N \supset \gamma(M) \supset \gamma(N) \supset \gamma^2(M) \supset \gamma^2(N) \supset \,\ldots\,, \tag{2.12}$$

plays an important role in the Subfactor Theory (see [26] and [22]).

Let $\mathcal{P}_+^\uparrow(1)$ denote the two-dimensional Lie group generated by the hyperbolic rotations

$$L_t : \mathbb{R}^2 \ni \begin{pmatrix} \xi_1 \\ \xi_2 \end{pmatrix} \longmapsto \begin{pmatrix} \cosh(2\pi t) & -\sinh(2\pi t) \\ -\sinh(2\pi t) & \cosh(2\pi t) \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \xi_1 \\ \xi_2 \end{pmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^2 \,, \qquad t \in \mathbb{R}$$

and the lightlike translations

$$T_s : \mathbb{R}^2 \ni \begin{pmatrix} \xi_1 \\ \xi_2 \end{pmatrix} \longmapsto \begin{pmatrix} \xi_1 + s \\ \xi_2 + s \end{pmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^2 \,, \quad s \in \mathbb{R}$$

(cf. [2], Ch. 17, § 2, A), which is the *Poincaré group on the light-ray.* Furthermore, the commutation relation

$$T_s \, L_t = L_t \, T_{e^{2\pi t} s} \,, \qquad s \,, \, t \in \mathbb{R}$$

implies that $(T_{s_1} L_{t_1}) \, (T_{s_2} \, L_{t_2}) = T_{s_1 + e^{-2\pi t_1} s_2} \, L_{t_1 + t_2}$. Therefore, endowing $\mathbb{R}^2$ with the Lie group structure defined by the composition law

$$(s_1, t_1) \cdot (s_2, t_2) = (s_1 + e^{-2\pi t_1} s_2 \,, \, t_1 + t_2) \,,$$

the mapping $\mathbb{R}^2 \ni (s,t) \longmapsto T_s \, L_t \in \mathcal{P}_+^\uparrow(1)$ becomes a Lie group isomorphism. In particular, $\mathcal{P}_+^\uparrow(1)$ is connected and simply connected. On the other hand, the map $\begin{pmatrix} e^{-2\pi t} & s \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \longmapsto T_s \, L_t$ is a Lie group isomorphism of the two-dimensional 2×2 matrix group $\mathcal{G} = \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} e^{-2\pi t} & s \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} ; \, s \,, \, t \in \mathbb{R} \right\}$ onto $\mathcal{P}_+^\uparrow(1)$. If we identify $\mathcal{P}_+^\uparrow(1)$ with $\mathcal{G}$ along the above isomorphism, the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{p}_+^\uparrow(1)$ of $\mathcal{P}_+^\uparrow(1)$ will be identified with the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$ of $\mathcal{G}$, and the exponential map $\mathfrak{p}_+^\uparrow(1) \longrightarrow \mathcal{P}_+^\uparrow(1)$ with the exponential map $\mathfrak{g} \longrightarrow \mathcal{G}$, that is with the usual exponentiation of the matrices belonging to $\mathfrak{g}$. We notice that $\mathfrak{g}$ is the set of all 2×2 real matrices X such that $\exp(t\,X) \in \mathcal{G}$, $t \in \mathbb{R}$, and $[X, Y] = XY - YX$ for all X , $Y \in \mathfrak{g}$. The elements

$$X_1 = \begin{pmatrix} -2\pi & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad X_2 = \begin{pmatrix} -2\pi & 2\pi \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad X_3 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \tag{2.13}$$

of $\mathfrak{g} \equiv \mathfrak{p}_+^\uparrow(1)$ are of particular interest: we have

$$X_3 = \frac{1}{2\pi} \big(X_2 - X_1 \big) \,, \quad [\, X_2 \,, \, X_1] = 4\,\pi^2 X_3 \,, \tag{2.14}$$

any two of $X_1 \,, X_2 \,, X_3$ is a basis for $\mathfrak{g} \equiv \mathfrak{p}_+^\uparrow(1)$ and

$$\exp(t\,X_j) = \begin{pmatrix} e^{-2\pi t} & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} e^{-2\pi t} & 1 - e^{-2\pi t} \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 1 & t \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \tag{2.15}$$

for $j = 1 \,, 2 \,, 3$, respectively.

According to the general theory of unitary representations of Lie groups (see e.g. [2], Ch. 11, § 1, B or [30], Section 10.1), if π is an *so*-continuous unitary representation of $\mathcal{G} \equiv \mathcal{P}_+^\uparrow(1)$ on a Hilbert space H and $\mathcal{D}_{\rm G}(\pi)$ denotes the Gårding subspace of H for π , then the formula

$$\mathrm{d}\pi(X)\,\xi = \frac{d}{dt}\,\pi\big(\exp(t\,X)\big)\,\xi \,\bigg|_{t=0} \,, \qquad X \in \mathfrak{p}_+^\uparrow(1) \,, \, \xi \in \mathcal{D}_{\rm G}(\pi)$$

defines a representation of the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{p}_+^\uparrow(1)$ into the Lie algebra of all skew-symmetric linear mappings $\mathcal{D}_{\rm G}(\pi) \to \mathcal{D}_{\rm G}(\pi)$. Moreover, for every $X \in \mathfrak{p}_+^\uparrow(1)$, the linear mapping $i\,\mathrm{d}\,\pi(X) : H \supset \mathcal{D}_{\mathrm{G}}(\pi) \longrightarrow \mathcal{D}_{\mathrm{G}}(\pi) \subset H$ is essentially selfadjoint (see e.g. [2], Ch. 11, § 2, Corollary 4 or [30], Corollary 10.2.11). Therefore, if $X \in \mathfrak{p}_+^{\uparrow}(1)$ and A is the selfadjoint linear operator in H, then

$$\pi\big(\exp(t\,X)\big) = \exp(itA) \ \text{ for all } \ t \in \mathbb{R} \quad \Longrightarrow \quad \overline{\mathrm{d}\,\pi(X)} = i\,A \tag{2.16}$$

(the first exp is the exponential map of the Lie group $\mathcal{P}_+^{\uparrow}(1)$, while the second one indicates functional calculus). Indeed, by the definition of $\mathrm{d}\,\pi(X)$ we have $\mathrm{d}\,\pi(X) \subset i\,A$, so the selfadjoint operator $\overline{-i\,\mathrm{d}\,\pi(X)}$ is contained in the selfadjoint operator A, which implies their equality.

We notice for completeness that, according to [16], Theorem 3.3, the Gårding subspace $\mathcal{D}_{\mathrm{G}}(\pi)$ is actually equal to the set of all C^{∞}-vectors for π.

We notice also the following simple fact concerning the essential selfadjointness of sums of symmetric operators: If H is a Hilbert space, $\mathcal{D} \subset H$ is a dense linear subspace and $A\,, B : \mathcal{D} \longrightarrow \mathcal{D}$ are linear operators, then

$$A\,,\ B \ \text{ symmetric },\ A+B \ \text{ essentially selfadjoint } \ \Longrightarrow \ \overline{A} + \overline{B} \subset \overline{A+B}\,. \tag{2.17}$$

Consequently also $\overline{A} + \overline{B}$ is essentially selfadjoint and $\overline{\overline{A} + \overline{B}} = \overline{A+B}$.

To prove (2.17), let $\eta \in \mathrm{Dom}\,(\overline{A}) \cap \mathrm{Dom}\,(\overline{B})$ be arbitrary. Then

$$\big(\eta \,|\, (A{+}B)\,\xi\big) = (\eta \,|\, A\,\xi) + (\eta \,|\, B\,\xi) = (\,\overline{A}\,\eta \,|\, \xi) + (\,\overline{B}\,\eta \,|\, \xi) = \big(\,(\,\overline{A}{+}\overline{B})\,\eta \,|\, \xi\big)\,, \quad \xi \in \mathcal{D}\,,$$

so η is in the domain of $(A{+}B)^* = \overline{A+B}$ and $(\overline{A+B})\,\eta = (A{+}B)^*\eta = (\,\overline{A}{+}\overline{B})\,\eta$.

(2.17) implies that, for any *so*-continuous unitary representation π of $\mathcal{P}_+^{\uparrow}(1)$,

$$\overline{\overline{\mathrm{d}\,\pi(X)} + \overline{\mathrm{d}\,\pi(Y)}} = \overline{\mathrm{d}\,\pi(X+Y)}\,, \qquad X\,,\ Y \in \mathfrak{p}_+^{\uparrow}(1)\,. \tag{2.18}$$

Theorem 2.1. (General Half-sided Modular Inclusion Theorem) *Let M be a von Neumann algebra on a Hilbert space H, in standard form with respect to a normal semifinite faithful weight φ on M, and $N \subset M$ a von Neumann subalgebra such that the restriction ψ of φ to N is semifinite and N is in standard form with respect to ψ. Let us denote for convenience*

$$\Delta_M = \Delta_{\varphi}\,,\ J_M = J_{\varphi} \ \textit{ and } \ \Delta_N = \Delta_{\psi}\,,\ J_N = J_{\psi}$$

and assume the following half-sided modular inclusion :

$$\Delta_M^{it}\, N\, \Delta_M^{-it} \subset N\,, \qquad t \leq 0\,. \tag{2.19}$$

Then

$$\frac{1}{2\,\pi}\,(\,\log \Delta_N - \log \Delta_M)\,, \tag{2.20}$$

defined on the intersection of the domains of $\log \Delta_N$ and $\log \Delta_M$, is an essentially selfadjoint operator with positive selfadjoint closure P and, letting

$$U(s) = \exp(isP)\,, \qquad s \in \mathbb{R}\,, \tag{2.21}$$

we have the following :

(1) $\Delta_M^{-it}\, U(s)\, \Delta_M^{it} = \Delta_N^{-it}\, U(s)\, \Delta_N^{it} = U(e^{2\,\pi\,t}s)\,, \qquad s\,,\ t \in \mathbb{R}\,;$
(2) $J_M\, U(s)\, J_M = J_N\, U(s)\, J_N = U(-s)\,, \qquad s \in \mathbb{R}\,;$
(3) $U\big(1 - e^{2\,\pi\,t}\big) = \Delta_N^{-it}\, \Delta_M^{it}$ *and* $\Delta_N^{it} = U(1)\, \Delta_M^{it}\, U(1)^*\,, \qquad t \in \mathbb{R}\,;$
(4) $U(2) = J_N\, J_M$ *and* $J_N = U(1)\, J_M\, U(1)^*\,;$
(5) $N = U(1)\, M\, U(1)^*\,;$
(6) $U(s)\, M\, U(s)^* \subset M\,, \qquad s \geq 0\,;$

(7) $\gamma_s = \mathrm{Ad}\, U(s)\,,\ s \geq 0$ *is an so-continuous one-parameter semigroup of* $*$-*endomorphisms of* M *such that* γ_2 *is equal to the canonical endomorphism* $\gamma = \mathrm{Ad}\,(J_N\, J_M)$ *of the inclusion* $N \subset M\,$; *thus* $\gamma_s(M)\,,\ s \geq 0\,$, *provide a continuous interpolation of the tunnel* (2.12):

$$\begin{aligned} M \supset \gamma_1(M) = N \supset \gamma_2(M) = \gamma(M) \supset \gamma_3(M) = \gamma(N) \supset \\ \supset \gamma_4(M) = \gamma^2(M) \supset \gamma_5(M) = \gamma^2(N) \supset \ \dots \ ; \end{aligned}$$

(8) *For* $x \in M$ *and* $s \geq 0$ *we have*

$$x \in \mathfrak{N}_\varphi \iff U(s)\, x\, U(s)^* \in \mathfrak{N}_\varphi \implies \big(U(s)\, x\, U(s)^*\big)_\varphi = U(s)\, x_\varphi \ ;$$

(9) *The weight* φ *on* M *is invariant under* γ_s *for every* $s \geq 0\,$;

(10) $\{\Delta_M^{it}\,,\ \Delta_N^{is}\,;\ t\,,\ s \in \mathbb{R}\}$ *generates a group of unitary operators on* $H\,$, *which is the image of an so-continuous unitary representation* π *of* $\mathcal{P}_+^{\uparrow}(1)$ *on* $H\,$, *uniquely determined by any two of the relations*

$$\overline{\mathrm{d}\pi(X_1)} = i\, \log \Delta_M\,, \quad \overline{\mathrm{d}\pi(X_2)} = i\, \log \Delta_N\,, \quad \overline{\mathrm{d}\pi(X_3)} = i\, P\,,$$

where $X_1\,, X_2\,, X_3 \in \mathfrak{p}_+^{\uparrow}(1)$ *are the Lie algebra elements defined in* (*2.13*)*.*

Remark. This theorem is a generalization of Wiesbrock's statement, where φ is assumed to be bounded.

The strategy of our proof. The proof will be given in Section 7 in several steps.

(i) First we study $\Delta_N^{-it}\, \Delta_M^{it}$ by using the Modular Extension Theorem which will be proved in Section 5.

(ii) Then we show that $\Delta_N^{-it}\, \Delta_M^{it}$ has a strong operator limit T for $t \longrightarrow -\infty\,$. For the existence of the wave operator T we use our generalization of the Borchers Structure Theorem which will be proved in Section 6.

(iii) Using the above ingredients, we define an *so*-continuous one-parameter family $U(s)\,,\ s \in \mathbb{R}\,$, of unitaries.

(iv) We prove that the defined family $U(s)\,,\ s \in \mathbb{R}\,$, is a one-parameter group having positive generator P and we verify that for it the statements (1) - (10) in Theorem 2.1 hold.

(v) Using that the generator P of $\mathbb{R} \ni s \to U(s)$ satisfies (10), (2.18) will imply that P is the closure of the operator (2.20).

We also prove the following result about the structure of half-sided modular inclusions:

Theorem 2.2. *Under the assumptions and with the notation as in Theorem 2.1, the following hold* :

(1) $\gamma_s(z) = z$ *for* $s \geq 0$ *and* $z \in Z(M)\,$, *so* $Z\big(\gamma_s(M)\big) = Z(M)$ *for all* $s \geq 0\,$.

(2) *There exists the greatest central projection* p *of* M *satisfying* $Mp = Np\,$. *For a projection* $e \in M$ *we have*

$$e \leq p \iff U(s)\, e = e \text{ for all } s \in \mathbb{R}\,,$$

while for a projection $e \in M^\varphi$ *with* $\gamma_s(e) = e\,,\ s \geq 0\,$, *we have even*

$$e \leq p \iff U(s)\, e\, J_M\, e\, J_M = e\, J_M\, e\, J_M \text{ for all } s \in \mathbb{R}\,.$$

(3)
$$M^\varphi \subset \bigcap_{s \geq 0} \gamma_s(M) \implies \bigcap_{s \geq 0} \gamma_s(M) = \big\{x \in M\,;\ \gamma_s(x) = x\,,\ s \geq 0\big\}\,.$$

$$(4)\qquad \overline{\mathfrak{M}_\varphi \cap M^\varphi}^{\,so} = M^\varphi \implies M^\varphi \subset \big\{x \in M\,;\, \gamma_s(x) = x\,,\ s \geq 0\big\}$$
$$\implies M(1_H - p) \text{ and } N(1_H - p) \text{ are of type } \mathrm{III}_1 \text{ whenever } p \neq 1_H\,.$$

Remarks. (1) is proved in the case of bounded φ in [9], Theorem 2.4, and for the general case we shall essentially repeat the same proof.

If φ is bounded, then the equality $\bigcap\limits_{s\geq 0}\gamma_s(M) = \{x \in M\,;\,\gamma_s(x) = x\,,\ s \geq 0\}$ in (3) follows from [24], Corollary 2.2, but for the proof of (3) in our setting we need a different method.

Finally, for bounded φ, the inclusion $M^\varphi \subset \{x \in M\,;\,\gamma_s(x) = x\,,\ s \geq 0\}$ and the type of $M\,(1_H - p)$ and $N\,(1_H - p)$ were established in [37] if M is a factor, and in [8], [9] in the case of a general M. However, there is a gap in the proof in [8], [9]: it is shown only that, for every $e \in M^\varphi$ majorized by $1_H - p$, the spectrum of $\Delta_\varphi \,|\, eH$ is $[0, +\infty)$, while the right proof requires that the spectrum of the modular operator of φ_e, which is $\Delta_\varphi \,|\, eJ_\varphi eJ_\varphi H$ (see (2.9)), be equal to $[0, +\infty)$.

We don't know if the above inclusion still holds without assuming the strong operator density of $\mathfrak{M}_\varphi \cap M^\varphi$ in M^φ. We notice that, by (3) and (4) in the above theorem, if $M^\varphi \subset \bigcap\limits_{s\geq 0}\gamma_s(M)$ would hold in general, then we would always have:

$$M^\varphi \subset \big\{x \in M\,;\,\gamma_s(x) = x\,,\ s \geq 0\big\} = \bigcap_{s\geq 0}\gamma_s(M)\,,$$
$$M(1_H - p)\,,\ N(1_H - p) \text{ are of type } \mathrm{III}_1 \text{ in the case } p \neq 1_H\,.$$

(c) The Analytic Extension Theorem.

Let $\beta \in \mathbb{R}$, $\beta \neq 0$. Set

$$\mathbb{S}_\beta = \{z \in \mathbb{C}\,;\, 0 < \beta^{-1}\,\Im z < 1\}\,.$$

$H^\infty(\mathbb{S}_\beta)$ will denote the Banach algebra of all bounded analytic complex functions on $\mathbb{S}_\beta$.

Most parts of the following Analytic Extension Theorem are known, but we shall give a proof for the convenience of the reader:

Theorem 2.3. (Analytic Extension Theorem) *Let A and B be invertible positive selfadjoint linear operators on the Hilbert spaces H and K respectively, $0 \neq \beta \in \mathbb{R}$, and $T \in B(K, H)$. Then the next statements $(1) - (5)$ are equivalent* :

(1) $\mathbb{R} \ni s \longmapsto A^{is}\,T\,B^{-is}$ *has a uniformly bounded so-continuous extension*
$$\overline{\mathbb{S}_\beta} \ni z \longmapsto T(z) \in B(K, H) \tag{2.22}$$
which is analytic in $\mathbb{S}_\beta$.

(2) $\mathbb{R} \ni s \longmapsto A^{is}\,T\,B^{-is}$ *has a wo-continuous extension (2.22) which is analytic in $\mathbb{S}_\beta$.*

(3) *There exists a Borel set $\Xi_o \subset \mathbb{R}$ of non-zero Lebesgue measure such that, for every $\xi \in K$ and $\eta \in H$, there exists an $f_{\xi,\eta} \in H^\infty(\mathbb{S}_\beta)$ satisfying*
$$\lim_{0<t/\beta\to 0} f_{\xi,\eta}(s + i\,t) = (A^{is}\,T\,B^{-is}\,\xi \,|\, \eta) \tag{2.23}$$
for almost all $s \in \Xi_o$.

(4) $A^{-\beta}\,T\,B^\beta$ *is defined and bounded on a core of B^β.*

(5) $\mathrm{Dom}\,(A^{-\beta}\,T\,B^{\beta}) = \mathrm{Dom}\,(B^{\beta})$ *and* $A^{-\beta}\,T\,B^{\beta}$ *is bounded.*

Moreover, if the above conditions are satisfied, then, for every $z \in \overline{\mathbb{S}_{\beta}}$,

$$\mathrm{Dom}\,(A^{iz}\,T\,B^{-iz}) = \mathrm{Dom}\,(B^{-iz})\,, \tag{2.24}$$

$$A^{iz}\,T\,B^{-iz} \subset T(z)\,, \tag{2.25}$$

$$A^{it}\,T(z)\,B^{-it} = T(z+t)\,, \qquad t \in \mathbb{R}\,. \tag{2.26}$$

Remark. A somewhat novel feature is the non-null Borel set Ξ_o in (3). We shall apply this Theorem in the case $K = H$, $T = 1_H$, $A = \Delta_M$, $B = \Delta_N$ and $\beta = -\frac{1}{2}$ in the proof of the Modular Extension Theorem (Theorem 2.12).

We notice that, for A and B as in Theorem 2.3, $\mathbb{R} \ni s \longmapsto \alpha_s = A^{is}\cdot B^{-is}$ is an *so*-continuous one-parameter group of linear isometries on $B(K,H)$. If, for some $T \in B(K,H)$ and $z \in \mathbb{C}$, the orbit $\mathbb{R} \ni s \longmapsto A^{is}\,T\,B^{-is}$ has an *so*-continuous extension

$$\overline{\mathbb{S}_{\Im z}} \ni \zeta \longmapsto T(\zeta) \in B(K,H)\,,$$

which is analytic in $\mathbb{S}_{\Im z}$, then we say that T belongs to the domain of α_z and define $\alpha_z(T) = T(z)$. According to Theorem 2.3, for $T \in B(K,H)$ the conditions

- $T \in \mathrm{Dom}\,(\alpha_z)$,
- $A^{iz}\,T\,B^{-iz}$ is defined and bounded on a core of B^{-iz} ,
- $\mathrm{Dom}\,(A^{iz}\,T\,B^{-iz}) = \mathrm{Dom}\,(B^{-iz})$ and $A^{iz}\,T\,B^{-iz}$ is bounded

are equivalent and, if they are satisfied, then $\alpha_z(T) = \overline{A^{iz}\,T\,B^{-iz}}$. For a more detailed study of the analytic extension operator α_z , especially in the most relevant case $z = -i$, when it is called the *analytic generator* of the group α , we refer to [12], [43] and [44].

Let us point out that, in general, the five equivalent statements in Theorem 2.3 are not equivalent with

(4′) $A^{-\beta}\,T\,B^{\beta}$ is densely defined and bounded.

Indeed:

Proposition 2.4. *There exist an invertible positive selfadjoint linear operator* A *on a Hilbert space* H *and a unitary* $v \in B(H)$ *, such that*

$A^{-1}vA$ *is densely defined and bounded, but*
$\mathrm{Dom}\,(A^{-1}vA)$ *is not a core for* A *.*

Remark. Actually the proof of Proposition 2.4, which will be given in Section 3, works to prove the next more general statement:

If A *and* B *are invertible positive selfadjoint linear operators on a non-zero Hilbert space, such that*

$$A^{it}B^{is}A^{-it} = e^{-its}B^{is}\,, \qquad t\,,\, s \in \mathbb{R}\,,$$

hence $A^{it}\underbrace{\exp\left(-B^{\pi}\right)}_{=\,b}A^{-it} = \big(\exp\left(-B^{\pi}\right)\big)^{e^{-\pi t}}$ *,* $t \in \mathbb{R}$ *, and further,*

$$A^{it}\,b^{is}A^{-it} = b^{ise^{-\pi t}}\,, \qquad t\,,\, s \in \mathbb{R}\,,$$

then, for every $s > 0$,

$$\mathrm{Dom}\,(A^{-1}\, b^{is} A) = \mathrm{Dom}\,(A) \text{ and } A^{-1}\, b^{is} A \subset b^{-is}\,,$$

while

$A^{-1}\, b^{-is} A$ *is densely defined and* $A^{-1}\, b^{-is} A \subset b^{is}$, *but*
$\mathrm{Dom}\,(A^{-1}\, b^{-is} A)$ *is not a core of* A .

Nevertheless, there are situations in which the above statement $(4')$ is equivalent with the statements $(1) - (5)$ in Theorem 2.3. One of such situations occurs in [36], Lemma 15.15 and Theorem 15.3, namely:

Let $M \subset B(H)$ *be a von Neumann algebra, in standard form with respect to a normal semifinite faithful weight* φ *on* M. *Then, for any* $a \in \mathfrak{N}_\varphi$, *the following are equivalent* :

(a) $\Delta_\varphi^{-1/2} a \Delta_\varphi^{1/2}$ *is densely defined and* $\| \Delta_\varphi^{-1/2} a\, \Delta_\varphi^{1/2} \| \leq 1$,
(b) $\| \Delta_\varphi^{1/2} a^* \Delta_\varphi^{-1/2} \| \leq 1$,
(c) $\mathrm{Dom}\,(\Delta_\varphi^{-1/2} a\, \Delta_\varphi^{1/2}) = \mathrm{Dom}\,(\Delta_\varphi^{1/2})$ *and* $\| \Delta_\varphi^{-1/2} a\, \Delta_\varphi^{1/2} \| \leq 1$.

Indeed, if (a) holds and $\eta \in \mathrm{Dom}\,(\Delta_\varphi^{1/2} a^* \Delta_\varphi^{-1/2})$, then

$$|(\Delta_\varphi^{1/2} a^* \Delta_\varphi^{-1/2} \eta \,|\, \xi)| = |(\eta \,|\, \Delta_\varphi^{-1/2} a\, \Delta_\varphi^{1/2} \xi)| \leq \|\eta\|\, \|\xi\|\,, \qquad \xi \in \mathrm{Dom}\,(\Delta_\varphi^{-1/2} a \Delta_\varphi^{1/2})\,.$$

Since $\mathrm{Dom}\,(\Delta_\varphi^{-1/2} a\, \Delta_\varphi^{1/2})$ is dense in H , we get $\| \Delta_\varphi^{1/2} a^* \Delta_\varphi^{-1/2} \eta \| \leq \|\eta\|$.

Next, $\mathrm{Dom}\,(\Delta_\varphi^{1/2} a^* \Delta_\varphi^{-1/2})$ always contains the core $\{ J_\varphi x_\varphi \,;\, x \in \mathfrak{A}_\varphi \}$ of $\Delta_\varphi^{-1/2}$. Indeed, if $x \in \mathfrak{A}_\varphi$, then $xa \in \mathfrak{A}_\varphi$ and so $a^* \Delta_\varphi^{-1/2} J_\varphi x_\varphi = a^* S_\varphi x_\varphi = a^* (x^*)_\varphi = \big((xa)^* \big)_\varphi$ belongs to $\mathrm{Dom}\, S_\varphi = \mathrm{Dom}\, \Delta_\varphi^{1/2}$.

Consequently, according to Theorem 2.3, (b) implies that $a^* \in \mathrm{Dom}\,(\sigma^\varphi_{-i/2})$ and $\| \sigma^\varphi_{-i/2}(a^*) \| \leq 1$. But then $a \in \mathrm{Dom}\,(\sigma^\varphi_{i/2})$ and $\sigma^\varphi_{i/2}(a)^* = \sigma^\varphi_{-i/2}(a^*)$, hence $\| \sigma^\varphi_{i/2}(a) \| = \| \sigma^\varphi_{-i/2}(a^*) \| \leq 1$. Using again Theorem 2.3, we obtain that (c) holds.

Finally, the implication $(c) \Rightarrow (a)$ is trivial.

(d) Lebesgue continuity, Tomita algebras.

Let $M \subset B(H)$ be a von Neumann algebra, in standard form with respect to a normal semifinite faithful weight φ on M .

The next lemma shows that 1_H can be approximated by particularly regular elements of $\mathfrak{M}_\varphi$ with respect to the *so*-topology:

Lemma 2.5. *There is an increasing net* $\{a_\iota\}_\iota$ *in* $\mathfrak{M}_\varphi \cap M^+$ *such that, for any* ι , *the orbit* $\mathbb{R} \ni s \longmapsto \sigma^\varphi_s(a_\iota) \in M$ *has an entire extension* $\mathbb{C} \ni z \longmapsto \sigma^\varphi_z(a_\iota) \in M$ *and*

- $\sigma^\varphi_z(a_\iota) \in \mathfrak{M}_\varphi$, $\sigma^\varphi_z(a_\iota)^* = \sigma^\varphi_{\overline{z}}(a_\iota)$, $\| \sigma^\varphi_z(a_\iota) \| \leq e^{(\Im z)^2}$ *for all* ι *and* $z \in \mathbb{C}$,
- $so - \lim\limits_\iota \sigma^\varphi_z(a_\iota) = 1_H$ *for all* $z \in \mathbb{C}$.

Nets $\{a_\iota\}_\iota$ as in Lemma 2.5 (called in [45], § 1 , regularizing nets for φ) will be used to prove the following description of $\mathfrak{N}_\varphi$:

Lemma 2.6. (1) *For* $x \in M$ *and* $c \geq 0$,

$$x \in \mathfrak{N}_\varphi \text{ and } \|x_\varphi\| \leq c \iff \|x\, J_\varphi\, y_\varphi\| \leq c\, \|y\| \text{ for all } y \in \mathfrak{M}_\varphi\,.$$

(2) *For* $x \in M$ *and* $\xi \in H$,

$$x \in \mathfrak{N}_\varphi \text{ and } x_\varphi = \xi \qquad \iff x\, J_\varphi\, y_\varphi = J_\varphi\, y\, J_\varphi\, \xi \text{ for all } y \in \mathfrak{M}_\varphi\,.$$

Using the above lemma, we get immediately

$$f \in L^1(\mathbb{R})\,,\ x \in \mathfrak{N}_\varphi \implies \begin{cases} wo - \displaystyle\int_{\mathbb{R}} f(t)\,\sigma_t^\varphi(x)\,dt \in \mathfrak{N}_\varphi \ \text{ and} \\ \left(wo - \displaystyle\int_{\mathbb{R}} f(t)\,\sigma_t^\varphi(x)\,dt \right)_\varphi = \displaystyle\int_{\mathbb{R}} f(t)\,\Delta_\varphi^{it}\,x_\varphi\,dt \\ \qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\quad = \hat{f}(\log \Delta_\varphi)\,x_\varphi\,, \end{cases} \tag{2.27}$$

where $\hat{f}$ is the inverse Fourier transform of f :

$$\hat{f}(\lambda) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} f(t)\,e^{i\,\lambda\,t}\,dt\,, \qquad \lambda \in \mathbb{R}\,. \tag{2.28}$$

Indeed, by (2.5) and (2.3) we have for every $y \in \mathfrak{N}_\varphi$

$$\begin{aligned} \left(wo - \int_{\mathbb{R}} f(t)\,\sigma_t^\varphi(x)\,dt \right) J_\varphi\,y_\varphi &= \int_{\mathbb{R}} f(t)\,\big(\sigma_t^\varphi(x)\,J_\varphi\,y_\varphi\big)\,dt \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}} f(t)\,\big(J_\varphi\,y\,J_\varphi\,\sigma_t^\varphi(x)_\varphi\big)\,dt \\ &= J_\varphi\,y\,J_\varphi \int_{\mathbb{R}} f(t)\,\Delta_\varphi^{it}\,x_\varphi\,dt\,, \end{aligned}$$

so we can apply Lemma 2.6.(2) to $wo - \displaystyle\int_{\mathbb{R}} f(t)\,\sigma_t^\varphi(x)\,dt$ and $\displaystyle\int_{\mathbb{R}} f(t)\,\Delta_\varphi^{it}\,x_\varphi\,dt$.

If φ is bounded, then the linear mapping $M \ni x \longmapsto x_\varphi = x\,\xi_\varphi \in H$ is bounded, but its inverse is in general not bounded. For unbounded φ even $x \longmapsto x_\varphi$ is not bounded. Nevertheless, both $\mathfrak{N}_\varphi \ni x \longmapsto x_\varphi \in H$ and its inverse have a dominated continuity property with respect to the *wo*-topology on M and the weak topology on H, called in [43], § 2, *Lebesgue continuity.* For the proof of Theorem 2.1 we need the following variant of [43], Section 4.6, Propositions 1 and 2, concerning the Lebesgue continuity of $x \longmapsto x_\varphi$ and $x_\varphi \longmapsto x$:

Proposition 2.7. *Let $M \subset B(H)$ be a von Neumann algebra, in standard form with respect to a normal semifinite faithful weight φ on M, and $\{x_\iota\}_\iota \subset \mathfrak{N}_\varphi$ a net.*

(1) *If $wo\!-\!\lim\limits_\iota x_\iota = x \in M$ and $\sup\limits_\iota \|(x_\iota)_\varphi\| < \infty$, then $x \in \mathfrak{N}_\varphi$ and $(x_\iota)_\varphi \xrightarrow{\iota} x_\varphi$ in the weak topology of H.*

(2) *If $(x_\iota)_\varphi \xrightarrow{\iota} \xi \in H$ in the weak topology of H and $\sup\limits_\iota \|x_\iota\| < \infty$, then there exists $x \in \mathfrak{N}_\varphi$ such that $wo - \lim\limits_\iota x_\iota = x$ and $x_\varphi = \xi$.*

Let $\mathfrak{T}_\varphi$ denote the set of all $x \in \mathfrak{A}_\varphi$ such that $\mathbb{R} \ni s \longmapsto \sigma_s^\varphi(x) \in M$ has an entire extension $\mathbb{C} \ni z \longmapsto \sigma_z^\varphi(x) \in M$ satisfying $\sigma_z^\varphi(x) \in \mathfrak{A}_\varphi$ for all $z \in \mathbb{C}$. Since

$$\begin{aligned} x\,,\, y \in \mathfrak{T}_\varphi &\implies x\,y \in \mathfrak{T}_\varphi \ \text{ and } \ \sigma_z^\varphi(x\,y) = \sigma_z^\varphi(x)\,\sigma_z^\varphi(y)\,,\ z \in \mathbb{C}\,, \\ x \in \mathfrak{T}_\varphi &\implies x^* \in \mathfrak{T}_\varphi \ \text{ and } \ \sigma_z^\varphi(x^*) = \sigma_{\overline{z}}^\varphi(x)^*\,,\ z \in \mathbb{C}\,, \end{aligned}$$

$\mathfrak{T}_\varphi$ is a $*$-subalgebra of $\mathfrak{A}_\varphi$, called the (maximal) *Tomita algebra* of φ.

In the next variant of [35], 10.21, Corollary 1, certain standard properties of the Tomita algebra $\mathfrak{T}_\varphi$ are formulated.

Proposition 2.8. *Let $M \subset B(H)$ be a von Neumann algebra, in standard form with respect to a normal semifinite faithful weight φ on M. Then*

$$x \in \mathfrak{T}_\varphi\,,\ z \in \mathbb{C} \implies x_\varphi \in \operatorname{Dom}(\Delta_\varphi^{iz}) \ \textit{and} \ \sigma_z^\varphi(x)_\varphi = \Delta_\varphi^{iz}\,x_\varphi \tag{2.29}$$

and, for every $y \in \mathfrak{A}_\varphi$ *, there exists a sequence* $\{y_n\}_{n\geq 1}$ *in* $\mathfrak{T}_\varphi$ *such that*

- $y_n \xrightarrow{so} y$ *and* $y_n^* \xrightarrow{so} y^*$,
- $(y_n)_\varphi \longrightarrow y_\varphi$ *and* $(y_n^*)_\varphi \longrightarrow (y^*)_\varphi$ *in the norm-topology of* H .
- $\|\sigma_z^\varphi(y_n)\| \leq e^{n(\Im z)^2}\|y\|$ *for all* $n \geq 1$ *and* $z \in \mathbb{C}$ *,*
- $\|\Delta_\varphi^{iz}(y_n)_\varphi\| \leq e^{n(\Im z)^2}\|y_\varphi\|$, $\|\Delta_\varphi^{iz}(y_n^*)_\varphi\| \leq e^{n(\Im z)^2}\|(y^*)_\varphi\|$ *for all* $n \geq 1$ *and* $z \in \mathbb{C}$ *.*

We notice that the set $\mathfrak{S}_\varphi$ of all $x \in \mathfrak{T}_\varphi$, for which

$$\|\sigma_z^\varphi(x)\| \leq e^{c(x)\,\Im z}\|x\| \, , \quad \|\Delta_\varphi^{iz}\, x_\varphi\| \leq e^{c(x)\,\Im z}\|x_\varphi\| \, , \qquad z \in \mathbb{C}$$

with $c(x) \geq 0$ a constant depending only on x , is a $*$-subalgebra of $\mathfrak{T}_\varphi$ and for every $y \in \mathfrak{A}_\varphi$ there exists a sequence $\{y_n\}_{n\geq 1}$ in $\mathfrak{S}_\varphi$ such that

- $y_n \xrightarrow{so} y$ and $y_n^* \xrightarrow{so} y^*$,
- $(y_n)_\varphi \longrightarrow y_\varphi$ and $(y_n^*)_\varphi \longrightarrow (y^*)_\varphi$ in the norm-topology of H

(see [35], 10.22).

(e) HERMITIAN MAPS.

Let H , K be Hilbert spaces and $M \subset B(H)$, $N \subset B(K)$ von Neumann algebras, in standard form with respect to the normal semifinite faithful weights φ on M and ψ on N . An essential role will be played by the fixed point real linear subspaces of K and H under S_ψ and S_φ , respectively:

$$K^{S_\psi} = \{\xi \in \operatorname{Dom}(S_\psi)\,;\, S_\psi\,\xi = \xi\} \, , \quad H^{S_\varphi} = \{\eta \in \operatorname{Dom}(S_\varphi)\,;\, S_\varphi\,\eta = \eta\} \, .$$

They have been used by various authors earlier: see, for example, [29] and [15].

Let us formulate the basic properties, for example, of K^{S_ψ} :

Lemma 2.9. (1) $K^{S_\psi} = \overline{\{x_\psi\,;\, x^* = x \in \mathfrak{N}_\psi\}}$.

(2) $\xi \in K$ *belongs to* K^{S_ψ} *if and only if* $(\xi \,|\, J_\psi\, x_\psi) \in \mathbb{R}$ *for all* $x^* = x \in \mathfrak{N}_\psi$.

(3) $\xi \in K$ *belongs to* K^{S_ψ} *if and only if* $(\xi \,|\, J_\psi\, x_\psi) = (J_\psi\,(x^*)_\psi \,|\, \xi)$ *for all* $x \in \mathfrak{A}_\psi$.

(4) $\operatorname{Dom} S_\psi = K^{S_\psi} + i\, K^{S_\psi}$.

Definition 2.10. (1) $T \in B(K,H)$ *is said to be Hermitian with respect to the weight pair* (ψ,φ) *if*

$$T\,K^{S_\psi} \subset H^{S_\varphi} \, .$$

(2) $T \in B(K,H)$ *is said to implement* ψ *in* φ *if*

$$x \in \mathfrak{N}_\psi \implies T\,x\,T^* \in \mathfrak{N}_\varphi \, , \; (T\,x\,T^*)_\varphi = T\,x_\psi \, .$$

Statement (3) in the next lemma explains why we call the fulfilment of the implication in Definition 2.10.(2) "implementation of ψ in φ by T".

Lemma 2.11. (1) $T \in B(K,H)$ *is Hermitian with respect to* (ψ,φ) *whenever it implements* ψ *in* φ *.*

(2) *If* $T \in B(K,H)$ *implements* ψ *in* φ *, then* $T\,N\,T^* \subset M$ *.*

(3) *If an isometric* $T \in B(K,H)$ *implements* ψ *in* φ *, then* $N \ni x \mapsto T\,x\,T^* \in M$ *is an injective* $*$*-homomorphism and*

$$\psi(a) = \varphi(T\,a\,T^*) \, , \qquad 0 \leq a \in \mathfrak{M}_\psi \, .$$

(4) *For bounded ψ and φ and the corresponding cyclic and separating vectors $\xi_\psi = (1_K)_\psi$ and $\eta_\varphi = (1_H)_\varphi$, an injective $T \in B(K,H)$ implements ψ in φ if and only if*
$$T\,N\,T^* \subset M \ \text{ and } \ T^*\,\eta_\varphi = \xi_\psi\,.$$

The following result provides important criteria for Hermiticity:

Theorem 2.12. (Modular Extension Theorem) *Let $M \subset B(H)$, $N \subset B(K)$ be von Neumann algebras, in standard form with respect to the normal semifinite faithful weights φ on M and ψ on N. Then for $T \in B(K,H)$ the following conditions $(1) - (8)$ are equivalent :*

(1) *T is Hermitian with respect to (ψ,φ) ;*
(2) *$T\,x_\psi \in H^{S_\varphi}$ for all $x^* = x \in \mathfrak{N}_\psi$;*
(3) *$(T\,x_\psi \,|\, J_\varphi\, y_\varphi) \in \mathbb{R}$ for all $x^* = x \in \mathfrak{N}_\psi$ and $y^* = y \in \mathfrak{N}_\varphi$;*
(4) *For every $x \in \mathfrak{A}_\psi$ and $y \in \mathfrak{A}_\varphi$ we have*
$$(T\,x_\psi \,|\, J_\varphi\, y_\varphi) = (J_\varphi\,(y^*)_\varphi \,|\, T\,(x^*)_\psi)\,;$$
(5) *$T\,S_\psi \subset S_\varphi\, T$;*
(6) *$\Delta_\varphi^{1/2}\, T\, \Delta_\psi^{-1/2}$ is defined on* Dom $\Delta_\psi^{-1/2}$ *and coincides there with $J_\varphi\, T\, J_\psi$;*
(7) *$J_\psi\, T^*\, J_\varphi$ is Hermitian with respect to (φ,ψ) ;*
(8) (Modular Extension Condition) *$\mathbb{R} \ni s \longmapsto \Delta_\varphi^{is}\, T\, \Delta_\psi^{-is} \in B(K,H)$ extends to a bounded so-continuous map*
$$\overline{\mathbb{S}_{-1/2}} \ni z \longmapsto T(z) \in B(K,H)\,,$$
analytic in $\mathbb{S}_{-1/2}$ and satisfying
$$T\Big(-\frac{i}{2}\Big) = J_\varphi\, T\, J_\psi\,. \tag{2.30}$$

Moreover, if the above equivalent conditions are satisfied, then, with the notation from the Modular Extension Condition (8)*, we have*
$$\|T(z)\| \le \|T\|\,, \qquad z \in \overline{\mathbb{S}_{-1/2}}\,, \tag{2.31}$$

$$T(z+t) = \Delta_\varphi^{it}\, T(z)\, \Delta_\psi^{-it}\,, \qquad z \in \overline{\mathbb{S}_{-1/2}}\,,\ t \in \mathbb{R}\,, \tag{2.32}$$

$$T\Big(s - \frac{i}{2}\Big) = J_\varphi\, T(s)\, J_\psi\,, \qquad s \in \mathbb{R} \tag{2.33}$$

and $T(s)$ is Hermitian with respect to (ψ,φ) for all $s \in \mathbb{R}$.

(f) GENERALIZATION OF THE STRUCTURE THEOREM OF BORCHERS.

Let M, N, φ, ψ be as in the preceding subsection, and $T \in B(K,H)$ Hermitian with respect to (ψ,φ). Then, by Theorem 2.12, the orbit $\mathbb{R} \ni s \longmapsto \Delta_\varphi^{is}\, T\, \Delta_\psi^{-is}$ of T has a bounded *so*-continuous extension $T(\,\cdot\,)$ to $\overline{\mathbb{S}_{-1/2}}$, analytic in $\mathbb{S}_{-1/2}$, which satisfies the boundary conditions
$$T(s) \text{ is Hermitian with respect to } (\psi,\varphi) \text{ for all } s \in \mathbb{R}\,,$$
$$J_\varphi\, T\Big(s - \frac{i}{2}\Big)\, J_\psi = T(s) \text{ is Hermitian with respect to } (\psi,\varphi) \text{ for all } s \in \mathbb{R}\,.$$

The next extension of a structure theorem of H. J. Borchers ([7], Theorem B, see also [6], Theorem 11.9 and [37], Theorem 2) shows, in particular, that also the converse statement holds, that is any bounded *so*-continuous map $\overline{\mathbb{S}_{-1/2}} \longrightarrow B(K,H)$, which is analytic in $\mathbb{S}_{-1/2}$ and satisfies the above boundary conditions, arises from a Hermitian $T \in B(K,H)$ as above.

Theorem 2.13. (Generalized Structure Theorem) *Let $M \subset B(H)$ and $N \subset B(K)$ be von Neumann algebras, in standard form with respect to the normal semifinite faithful weights φ on M and ψ on N . Further let $0 \neq \beta \in \mathbb{R}$, Ξ_o and Ξ_1 be Lebesgue null sets in $\mathbb{R}$, and*

$$\overline{\mathbb{S}_\beta} \setminus \big(\Xi_o \cup (\Xi_1 + i\beta)\big) \ni z \longmapsto T(z) \in B(K,H)$$

be a bounded map which is analytic in $\mathbb{S}_\beta$ and satisfies the boundary conditions

(i) *$T(s)$ is Hermitian with respect to (ψ,φ) for all $s \in \mathbb{R}\setminus\Xi_o$ and*

$$T(s) = wo-\lim_{0<t/\beta\to 0} T(s+it)\,, \qquad s\in\mathbb{R}\setminus\Xi_o\,, \tag{2.34}$$

(ii) *$J_\varphi\, T(s+i\beta)\, J_\psi$ is Hermitian with respect to (ψ,φ) for all $s\in\mathbb{R}\setminus\Xi_1$ and*

$$T(s+i\beta) = wo-\lim_{1>t/\beta\to 1} T(s+it)\,, \qquad s\in\mathbb{R}\setminus\Xi_1\,. \tag{2.35}$$

Then, for some $T\in B(K,H)$ which is Hermitian with respect to (ψ,φ) ,

$$T(s) = \Delta_\varphi^{-i\frac{s}{2\beta}}\, T\, \Delta_\psi^{i\frac{s}{2\beta}}\,, \qquad s\in\mathbb{R}\setminus\Xi_o\,. \tag{2.36}$$

Hence the given map $z\mapsto T(z)$ extends to an so-continuous map on the whole $\overline{\mathbb{S}_\beta}$ and, with the same notation $T(\,\cdot\,)$ for the extension, it satisfies

$$T(z+2\beta t) = \Delta_\varphi^{-it}\, T(z)\, \Delta_\psi^{it}\,, \qquad z\in\overline{\mathbb{S}_\beta}\,,\ t\in\mathbb{R}\,, \tag{2.37}$$

$$T(s+i\beta) = J_\varphi\, T(s)\, J_\psi\,, \qquad s\in\mathbb{R}\,. \tag{2.38}$$

Remark. Our theorem owes much to Borchers' work, its proof being based on the main idea of the proof of Theorem B in [7]. Nevertheless, our approach has several features of generality:

(a) $z\longmapsto T(z)$ is not assumed to be *so*-continuous on the whole $\overline{\mathbb{S}_\beta}$, but only the existence of radial limits are assumed almost everywhere on the boundary. In our application to the proof of Theorem 2.1 we shall use Theorem 2.13 with $\Xi_o = \{0\}$ and $\Xi_1 = \emptyset$.

(b) We are considering the case of arbitrary normal semifinite faithful weights φ and ψ , without assuming their boundedness.

(c) On the boundary we assume only the Hermiticity of $T(s)$ and $J_\varphi\, T(s+i\beta)\, J_\psi$ rather than the implementation of ψ in φ by these operators. The advantage of our assumption consists in its linearity, which allows "mollification", while Borchers' assumption is of quadratic nature, more difficult to handle.

(d) Our proof is made more elementary, avoiding most arguments of the two-dimensional complex analysis and using instead of the Malgrange-Zerner Theorem only the elementary Osgood Lemma (the Hartogs Theorem for continuous functions) along with the Morera Theorem (one-dimensional edge-of-the-wedge theorem).

(g) COMPLEMENTS TO THE IMPLEMENTATION THEOREM OF BORCHERS.

Based on the ideas from [1], an invariant subspace theory was developed in [44] for the "bounded analytic" elements associated to an *so*-continuous one-parameter group $(\alpha_t)_{t\in\mathbb{R}}$ of $*$-automorphisms of a von Neumann algebra $M \subset B(H)$. This theory allows, starting with an already existent one-parameter group of unitaries on H which implements α, to construct canonically a new implementing group of unitaries on H, which has a minimality property and inherits certain properties of the $*$-automorphism group α (see [1], Proposition in Section 3, where the idea is formulated in the realm of a particular situation, and [44], Theorem 5.3, Corollary 5.4, Lemma 5.11 for the general theory).

The above method yields a proof for the one-parameter version of the celebrated implementation theorem of Borchers [5], claiming the innerness of α whenever it is implemented by a one-parameter group of unitaries $\big(U(s)\big)_{s\in\mathbb{R}}$ having positive generator (see [1], Theorem 3.1 and [44], Corollary 5.7). Moreover, as we shall see in the next theorem, the obtained canonical inner implementing group of unitaries inherits certain commutation properties of the $*$-automorphism group α.

We recall that, if M is a von Neumann algebra and $(\alpha_s)_{s\in\mathbb{R}}$ is an *so*-continuous one-parameter group of $*$-automorphisms of M, then the *spectral subspace* of α corresponding to a closed set $F \subset \mathbb{R}$ is defined by

$$M^{\alpha}(F) = \Big\{\, x\in M\,;\, wo-\int_{\mathbb{R}} f(s)\,\alpha_s(x)\,ds = 0 \ \text{ if } f\in L^1(\mathbb{R})\,,\ F\cap \operatorname{supp}(\hat{f}) = \emptyset \,\Big\}\,,$$

where $\hat{f}$ denotes the inverse Fourier transform (2.28) of f (see [1], Definition 2.1).

Theorem 2.14. *Let $M \subset B(H)$ be a von Neumann algebra and P a selfadjoint operator in H, such that P is bounded below and* Ad $\exp(isP)$ *leaves M invariant for all $s\in\mathbb{R}$, defining thus an so-continuous one-parameter group $(\alpha_s)_{s\in\mathbb{R}}$ of $*$-automorphisms of M. Then there exists a unique injective $b\in M$, $0\leq b\leq 1_H$, such that*

(i) $\alpha_s(x) = b^{-is}x\,b^{is}\,,\quad s\in\mathbb{R}\,,\ x\in M\,,$

(ii) *for any injective $d\in M$, $0\leq d\leq 1_H$, such that the implementation relation $\alpha_s(x) = d^{-is}x\,d^{is}$, $s\in\mathbb{R}$, $x\in M$ holds, we have*

$$\chi_{(0,e^{\lambda}]}(b) \leq \chi_{(0,e^{\lambda}]}(d)\,, \qquad \lambda\in\mathbb{R}\,,$$

where $\chi_{(0,e^{\lambda}]}$ stands for the characteristic function of $(0,e^{\lambda}]$.

Moreover,

(iii) *for every $\lambda\in\mathbb{R}$, $\chi_{(0,e^{\lambda}]}(b)$ is the orthogonal projection onto*

$$\bigcap_{\mu>\lambda} \textit{the closed linear span of } M^{\alpha}\big([-\mu,+\infty)\big)\,H\,,$$

(iv) *for any $*$-automorphism σ of M and $\lambda_\sigma>0$, such that $\sigma\circ\alpha_s = \alpha_{\lambda_\sigma s}\circ\sigma$ for all $s\in\mathbb{R}$, we have $\sigma(b) = b^{\lambda_\sigma}$.*

The above theorem will be used in the proof of Theorem 2.2.

(h) SUMMARY OF THE REMAINING PART OF THE PAPER.

The remainder of this paper presents proofs for the above results:

- Theorem 2.3 and Proposition 2.4 in Section 3,
- Lemma 2.5, Lemma 2.6, Proposition 2.7 and Proposition 2.8 in Section 4,

- Lemma 2.9, Lemma 2.11 and Theorem 2.12 in Section 5,
- Theorem 2.13 in Section 6,
- Theorem 2.1 in Section 7 and, finally,
- Theorem 2.14 and Theorem 2.2 in Section 8.

3. The Analytic Extension Theorem

The aim of this section is to prove Theorem 2.3 and Proposition 2.4.

Proof of **Theorem 2.3**.

The equivalence of conditions (2), (4) and (5), as well as the three additional statements (2.24), (2.25), (2.26) were proved in [12], Theorem 6.2.

For the proof of the remaining part, we introduce the following notation: let $K_c(B)$ and $H_c(A)$ be the set of all vectors $\xi \in K$ and $\eta \in H$, respectively, with compact spectral support for $\log B$ and $\log A$, respectively. For such ξ and η, $\mathbb{C} \ni z \longmapsto B^{iz}\,\xi$ and $\mathbb{C} \ni z \longmapsto A^{iz}\,\eta$ are analytic functions of exponential type with respect to $\operatorname{Im} z$ and they are uniformly bounded in $\overline{\mathbb{S}_\beta}$. Furthermore, $K_c(B) \subset K$ and $H_c(A) \subset H$ are dense linear subspaces and they are cores of B^{iz} and A^{iz} for every $z \in \mathbb{C}$, respectively.

Proof of (2) ⇒ (1). The uniform boundedness of $\overline{\mathbb{S}_\beta} \ni z \longmapsto T(z)$ and its *so*-continuity are to be proved. The latter is automatic on $\mathbb{S}_\beta$, where $T(\,\cdot\,)$ is analytic.

Let $\xi \in K_c(B)$ and $\eta \in H_c(A)$. Then

$$(T(z)\,\xi \,|\, \eta) = (T\,B^{-iz}\,\xi \,|\, A^{-i\,\overline{z}}\,\eta)\,, \qquad z \in \overline{\mathbb{S}_\beta}\,,$$

because the analytic function $\mathbb{C} \ni z \longmapsto (T\,B^{-iz}\,\xi \,|\, A^{-i\,\overline{z}}\,\eta)$ and the continuous function $\overline{\mathbb{S}_\beta} \ni z \longmapsto (T(z)\,\xi \,|\, \eta)$, which is analytic in the interior, coincide on $\mathbb{R}$. By (2.24) and by the density of $H_c(A)$ in H, it follows that

$$T(z)\,\xi = A^{i\,z}\,T\,B^{-iz}\,\xi\,, \qquad z \in \overline{\mathbb{S}_\beta}\;,\; \xi \in K_c(B)\,. \tag{3.1}$$

Since $\|A^{iz}\,T\,B^{-iz}\| = \|T\|$ for $z \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\|A^{iz}\,T\,B^{-iz}\| = \|A^{-\beta}\,T\,A^{\beta}\|$ for $z \in \mathbb{R} + i\,\beta$ by (5), we have by the Three Line Theorem

$$|(T(z)\,\xi \,|\, \eta)| \le \max\big(\|T\|\,,\,\|A^{-\beta}\,T\,A^{\beta}\|\big)\,\|\xi\|\,\|\eta\|\,, \qquad z \in \overline{\mathbb{S}_\beta}\,,$$

obtaining thus the uniform boundedness of $\overline{\mathbb{S}_\beta} \ni z \longmapsto T(z)$.

Due to this uniform boundedness, it suffices to prove the convergences

$$\lim_{\overline{\mathbb{S}_\beta} \ni z \to s} \|T(z)\,\xi - A^{is}\,T\,B^{-is}\,\xi\| = 0\,, \qquad s \in \mathbb{R}\,, \tag{3.2}$$

$$\lim_{\overline{\mathbb{S}_\beta} \ni z \to s + i\,\beta} \|T(z)\,\xi - A^{is-\beta}\,T\,B^{-is+\beta}\,\xi\| = 0\,, \qquad s \in \mathbb{R} \tag{3.3}$$

for $\xi \in K_c(B)$. We give a proof explicitly only for $\beta > 0$, the treatment of the case $\beta < 0$ being completely similar.

Let E denote the spectral projection of $\log A$ corresponding to $(-\infty, 0]$. Owing to (3.1) we can split $T(z)\,\xi$ as follows:

$$T(z) = \big(A^{iz}\,(1_H - E)\big)\,T\,B^{-iz}\,\xi + \big(A^{iz+\beta}\,E\big)\,(A^{-\beta}\,T\,B^{\beta})\,B^{-iz-\beta}\,\xi\,, \qquad z \in \overline{\mathbb{S}_\beta}\,.$$

We note that

$A^{iz}\,(1_H - E)$ is defined on H and $\|A^{iz}\,(1_H - E)\| \le 1$ for all $z \in \mathbb{C}\,, \operatorname{Im} z \ge 0\,,$

$A^{iz+\beta}\, E$ is defined on H and $\| A^{iz+\beta}\, E\| \leq 1$ for all $z \in \mathbb{C}\,, \operatorname{Im} z \leq \beta\,.$
Now the norm-continuity of $\overline{\mathbb{S}_\beta} \ni z \mapsto B^{-iz}\,\xi$ and $\overline{\mathbb{S}_\beta} \ni z \mapsto B^{-iz-\beta}\,\xi\,,$ the *so*-continuity of $\overline{\mathbb{S}_\beta} \ni z \mapsto A^{iz}\,(1_H - E)$ and $\overline{\mathbb{S}_\beta} \ni z \mapsto A^{iz+\beta}\,E\,,$ and the boundedness of $A^{-\beta}\,T\,B^{\beta}$ on $K_c(B)$ yield the convergences (3.2) and (3.3).

Proof of $(1) \Rightarrow (3)$: obvious, with $\Xi_o = \mathbb{R}\,.$

Proof of $(3) \Rightarrow (4)$. We proceed in three steps.

Step 1. First we quote some results from the theory of the Hardy spaces on the disc. Let $H^\infty(\mathbb{D})$ be the Banach algebra of all bounded analytic complex functions on the unit disc

$$\mathbb{D} = \{ z \in \mathbb{C}\,;\, |z| < 1\}\,.$$

Any $g \in H^\infty(\mathbb{D})$ has a non-tangential limit

$$\widetilde{g}(\zeta) = \lim_{\mathbb{D}\,\ni z \to \zeta} g(z)$$

for almost all ζ in the boundary $\partial\,\mathbb{D}$ of $\mathbb{D}$ (the unit circle) due to Fatou's Theorem (see, for example, the second Corollary on page 38 of [20] or the theorems on pages 5 and 14 of [21]). Furthermore, the map $H^\infty(\mathbb{D}) \ni g \longmapsto \widetilde{g} \in L^\infty(\partial\,\mathbb{D})$ obtained this way is an isometric algebra homomorphism. On the other hand, the range $\{\widetilde{g}\,;\, g \in H^\infty(\mathbb{D})\}$ of the above homomorphism is equal to

$$\{\psi \in L^\infty(\partial\,\mathbb{D})\ ;\ \int_0^{2\pi} \psi(e^{is})\, e^{iks}\, ds = 0 \ \text{ for all } \ k = 1\,,\, 2\,,\, \dots\}$$

and hence it is weak*closed (see, for example, [14], § 20.1). We notice also that, according to a uniqueness theorem of the Riesz brothers (see, for example, the second Corollary on page 52 of [20] or the Theorem on page 76 of [21]), if for some $g \in H^\infty(\mathbb{D})$ the boundary function $\widetilde{g}$ vanishes almost everywhere on a Borel subset of $\partial\,\mathbb{D}$ with non-zero arc length measure, then $g = 0\,.$

We consider the one point compactification of the right half and the left half of $\overline{\mathbb{S}_\beta}$ and denote each added point by $+\infty$ and $-\infty\,,$ respectively. We extend the function

$$\overline{\mathbb{D}} \setminus \{+1\,,\,-1\} \ni \zeta \longmapsto \Phi_\beta(\zeta) = \frac{\beta}{\pi}\,\log\left(i\,\frac{1+\zeta}{1-\zeta}\right) \in \overline{\mathbb{S}_\beta}$$

to be $+\infty$ at $\zeta = +1$ and $-\infty$ at $\zeta = -1\,.$ Then the extended function

$$\overline{\mathbb{D}} \ni \zeta \longmapsto \Phi_\beta(\zeta) = \frac{\beta}{\pi}\,\log\left(i\,\frac{1+\zeta}{1-\zeta}\right) \in \overline{\mathbb{S}_\beta} \cup \{-\infty\,,\,+\infty\}$$

is a homeomorphism, mapping $\mathbb{D}$ onto $\mathbb{S}_\beta$ conformally, and the boundary $\partial\,\mathbb{D}$ onto $\partial\,\mathbb{S}_\beta \cup \{-\infty\,,\,+\infty\}$ absolutely bicontinuously with respect to the arc length measures: if Ξ is a Borel set in $\partial\,\mathbb{D}\,,$ then Ξ has arc length measure 0 if and only if $\Phi_\beta(\Xi)$ has arc length measure $0\,.$ Moreover, Φ_β maps paths in $\mathbb{D}$ tending to a $\zeta \in \partial\,\mathbb{D} \setminus \{1, -1\}$ from within a sector of opening $< \pi$ having vertex at $\zeta\,,$ and symmetric about the inner normal to $\partial\,\mathbb{D}$ in $\zeta\,,$ to paths tending to $\Phi_\beta(\zeta) \in \partial\,\mathbb{S}_\beta$ in a similar non-tangential way. Therefore, if $f \in H^\infty(\mathbb{S}_\beta)\,,$ the non-tangential limit

$$\widetilde{f}(\zeta) = \lim_{\mathbb{D}\,\ni z \to \zeta} f(z)$$

exists for almost all ζ in $\partial\,\mathbb{S}_\beta$ by Fatou's Theorem applied to $f \circ \Phi_\beta\,.$ Similarly we can transcribe the above quoted results concerning $H^\infty(\mathbb{D})$ in the setting of $H^\infty(\mathbb{S}_\beta):$ $H^\infty(\mathbb{S}_\beta) \ni g \longmapsto \widetilde{g} \in L^\infty(\partial\,\mathbb{S}_\beta)$ is an isometric algebra homomorphism with weak*closed range in $L^\infty(\partial\,\mathbb{S}_\beta)$ and $f\in H^\infty(\mathbb{S}_\beta)$ is equal to zero whenever $\widetilde{f}$ vanishes almost everywhere on a Borel subset of $\partial\,\mathbb{S}_\beta$ with non-zero arc length measure.

Step 2. We consider the map

$$F : K\times H \ni (\xi\,,\,\eta)\longmapsto \widetilde{f}_{\xi,\eta}\in\{\widetilde{f}\,;\,f\in H^\infty(\mathbb{S}_\beta)\}\subset L^\infty(\partial\,\mathbb{S}_\beta)\,,$$

where, as noticed in Step 1, $\{\widetilde{f}\,;\,f\in H^\infty(\mathbb{S}_\beta)\}$ is a weak*closed subalgebra of $L^\infty(\partial\,\mathbb{S}_\beta)$. The function $f_{\xi,\eta}$ is uniquely determined by (2.23) due to the uniqueness result quoted in Step 1. Since the right hand side of (2.23) is sesquilinear in ξ and η, the mapping F is also sesquilinear. We shall prove in this step that F is bounded.

We first prove that the graph of F is closed. Suppose that $\xi_n\longrightarrow\xi_o$, $\eta_n\longrightarrow\eta_o$ and $\widetilde{f}_{\xi_n,\eta_n}\longrightarrow\widetilde{f}_o$ with respect to the norm of $L^\infty(\partial\,\mathbb{S}_\beta)$, hence also $f_{\xi_n,\eta_n}\longrightarrow f_o$ uniformly. By the continuity of the right hand side of (2.23) in ξ and η, $\widetilde{f}_o$ has to satisfy (2.23) for $\xi=\xi_o$ and $\eta=\eta_o$ almost everywhere on the set Ξ_o. Therefore $\widetilde{f}_o=\widetilde{f}_{\xi_o,\eta_o}$, again by the uniqueness theorem of the Riesz brothers, proving that the graph of F is closed.

Let us consider $F(\xi\,,\,\cdot\,)$ for a fixed ξ. Denote by $\overline{H}$ the conjugate of the Hilbert space H and by $\overline{\eta}$ the canonical image of $\eta\in H$ in $\overline{H}$. By the above proved closedness of the graph of F, the graph of the linear map $\overline{H}\ni\overline{\eta}\longmapsto F(\xi\,,\,\eta)\in L^\infty(\partial\,\mathbb{S}_\beta)$ is closed and hence, by the Closed Graph Theorem,

$$\|F(\xi\,,\,\eta)\|\leq c_\xi\,\|\eta\|\,,\qquad \eta\in H$$

for some constant $c_\xi\geq 0$ depending on ξ. Thus $F(\xi\,,\,\cdot\,):\overline{H}\longrightarrow L^\infty(\partial\,\mathbb{S}_\beta)$ is bounded.

Now we prove that the graph of the linear map

$$K\ni\xi\longmapsto F(\xi\,,\,\cdot\,)\in B\big(\overline{H}\,,\,L^\infty(\partial\,\mathbb{S}_\beta)\big)$$

is closed. Suppose that $\xi_n\longrightarrow\xi_o$ and $F(\xi_n\,,\,\cdot\,)\longrightarrow T_o$ with respect to the norm of $B\big(\overline{H}\,,\,L^\infty(\partial\,\mathbb{S}_\beta)\big)$. Then, for every $\eta\in H$, $F(\xi_n\,,\,\eta)\longrightarrow T_o\,\eta$ and by the closedness of the graph of F it follows that $T_o\,\eta=F(\xi_o\,,\,\eta)$. Thus $T_o=F(\xi_o\,,\,\cdot\,)$.

By the Closed Graph Theorem

$$\|F(\xi\,,\,\cdot\,)\|\leq c\,\|\xi\|\,,\qquad \xi\in K$$

for some constant $c\geq 0$, so

$$\|F(\xi\,,\,\eta)\|=\operatorname*{ess\,sup}_{\zeta\in\partial\,\mathbb{S}_\beta}|\widetilde{f}_{\xi,\eta}(\zeta)|=\sup_{z\in\mathbb{S}_\beta}|f_{\xi,\eta}(z)|\leq c\,\|\xi\|\,\|\eta\|\,,\qquad \xi\in K\,,\,\eta\in H\,.$$

Step 3. We now take $\xi\in K_c(B)$, $\eta\in H_c(A)$. Then

$$\mathbb{C}\ni z\longmapsto g_{\xi,\eta}(z)=(T\,B^{-iz}\,\xi\,|\,A^{-i\,\overline{z}}\,\eta)$$

is an entire function satisfying the boundary condition (2.23), so that $g_{\xi,\eta}=f_{\xi,\eta}$ by the uniqueness theorem of the Riesz brothers. Therefore

$$|g_{\xi,\eta}(z)|\leq c\,\|\xi\|\,\|\eta\|\,,\qquad z\in\mathbb{S}_\beta$$

and hence the same estimate holds for all $z\in\overline{\mathbb{S}_\beta}$ by continuity. This implies

$$T\,B^{-iz}\,\xi\in\operatorname{Dom}(A^{iz})\,,$$

because $H_c(A)$ is a core of A^{iz}, and

$$\|A^{iz}\,T\,B^{-iz}\,\xi\|\leq c\,\|\xi\|\,,\qquad z\in\overline{\mathbb{S}_\beta}\,.$$

Since $K_c(B)$ is a core of B^{-iz}, setting $z = i\,\beta$ we obtain (4).

□

Proof of **Proposition 2.4**.

Let us denote:

by λ_t the translation operator $\xi \longmapsto \xi(\,\cdot\, - t)$ on $L^2(\mathbb{R})$, $t \in \mathbb{R}$,

by α_t the $*$-automorphism $\mathrm{Ad}\,(\lambda_t)$ of $B(H)$, $t \in \mathbb{R}$, and

by b the multiplication operator with $e^{-e^{\pi\,\cdot}}$ on $L^2(\mathbb{R})$.

Clearly, $(\alpha_t)_{t\in\mathbb{R}}$ is an *so*-continuous one-parameter group of $*$-automorphisms of $B(H)$, $0 \le b \le 1_{L^2(\mathbb{R})}$ and b is injective. Since

$$\alpha_t(b) = \lambda_t\, b\, \lambda_t^* = b^{\,e^{-\pi t}}\,, \qquad t \in \mathbb{R}\,,$$

we have

$$\alpha_t(b^{is}) = \lambda_t\, b^{is} \lambda_t^* = b^{\,ise^{-\pi t}}\,, \qquad t\,,\, s \in \mathbb{R}\,. \tag{3.4}$$

By the Stone Representation Theorem there exists an invertible positive selfadjoint linear operator A on $L^2(\mathbb{R})$ such that $\lambda_t = A^{it}$, $t \in \mathbb{R}$. Then

$$\alpha_t = \mathrm{Ad}\,(A^{it})\,, \qquad t \in \mathbb{R}\,. \tag{3.5}$$

Let $s > 0$ be arbitrary. Since $0 \le b \le 1_{L^2(\mathbb{R})}$ and $\Re\,(ise^{-\pi z}) = s\,e^{-\pi\Re z}\sin(\pi\Im z)$, the complex power $b^{ise^{-\pi z}} \in B\big(L^2(\mathbb{R})\big)$ is defined and $\|\, b^{ise^{-\pi z}} \| \le 1$ for every z in the closed strip $\overline{\mathbb{S}_1}$. Using (3.4), it is easily seen that

$$F_1 : \overline{\mathbb{S}_1} \ni z \longmapsto b^{ise^{-\pi z}} \in B\big(L^2(\mathbb{R})\big)$$

is an *so*-continuous extension of $\mathbb{R} \ni t \longmapsto \alpha_t(b^{is})$, which is analytic in $\mathbb{S}_1$ and whose value at i is b^{-is}. Taking into account (3.5), Theorem 2.3 yields that

$$\mathrm{Dom}\,(A^{-1}b^{is}A) = \mathrm{Dom}\,(A) \ \text{ and } \ A^{-1}b^{is}A \subset b^{-is}\,,$$

that is $A^{-1}b^{is}A = b^{-is}\,|\,\mathrm{Dom}\,(A)$. Therefore

$$\mathrm{Dom}\,(A^{-1}b^{-is}A) = b^{-is}\big(\,\mathrm{Dom}\,(A)\big) \text{ is dense in } H \text{ and } A^{-1}b^{-is}A \subset b^{is}\,. \tag{3.6}$$

But

$$\mathrm{Dom}\,(A^{-1}b^{-is}A) \text{ is not a core of } A\,. \tag{3.7}$$

Indeed, assuming that $\mathrm{Dom}\,(A^{-1}b^{-is}A)$ is a core of A, (3.6) and Theorem 2.3 imply that $\mathbb{R} \ni t \longmapsto \alpha_t(b^{-is})$ has a uniformly bounded *so*-continuous extension

$$F_2 : \overline{\mathbb{S}_1} \longrightarrow B\big(L^2(\mathbb{R})\big)\,,$$

which is analytic in $\mathbb{S}_1$ and whose value at i is b^{is}. Then

$$\overline{\mathbb{S}_{-1}} \ni z \longmapsto F_2(\overline{z})^* \in B\big(L^2(\mathbb{R})\big)$$

is an *so*-continuous extension of $\mathbb{R} \ni t \longmapsto \alpha_t(b^{is})$, which is analytic in $\mathbb{S}_{-1}$ and whose value at $-i$ is b^{-is}. Consequently, $\mathbb{R} \ni t \longmapsto \alpha_t(b^{is})$ has a uniformly bounded *so*-continuous extension

$$F : \overline{\mathbb{S}_1 \cup \mathbb{S}_{-1}} \ni z \longmapsto \begin{cases} F_1(z) & \text{if } \Im z \ge 0 \\ F_2(\overline{z})^* & \text{if } \Im z \le 0 \end{cases}\,,$$

which is analytic in the interior and which takes the same value b^{-is} at i and $-i$. Then, by (2.26), F is periodic of period $2\,i$, so it extends to a uniformly bounded entire mapping, which must be constant by the Liouville Theorem. Thus the orbit $\mathbb{R} \ni t \longmapsto \alpha_t(b^{is})$ is constant, that is b^{is} commutes with every λ_t. Since b^{is} is the multiplication operator with $\mathbb{R} \ni r \longmapsto e^{-ise^{\pi r}}$ on $L^2(\mathbb{R})$, this means that the above function is constant, what is plainly not true.

By (3.6) and by (3.7) we conclude that, choosing $v = b^{-is}$ with $s > 0$, $A^{-1}vA$ is densely defined and bounded, but $\mathrm{Dom}\,(A^{-1}vA)$ is not a core for A.

$\square$

4. Lebesgue Continuity, Tomita Algebras

In this section we prove Lemmas 2.5 and 2.6, as well as Propositions 2.7 and 2.8. Throughout this section $M \subset B(H)$ will stand for a von Neumann algebra, in standard form with respect to a normal semifinite faithful weight φ on M.

Proof of **Lemma 2.5**.

Since $\mathfrak{M}_\varphi$ is a hereditary $*$-subalgebra of M, there is an increasing approximate unit $\{b_\iota\}_\iota$ for $\mathfrak{M}_\varphi$ (for example, the upward directed set $\{b \in \mathfrak{M}_\varphi \cap M^+ \,;\, \|b\| < 1\}$, labeled by itself). Then, by the *so*-density of $\mathfrak{M}_\varphi$ in M, we have $so-\lim\limits_\iota b_\iota = 1_H$. Setting

$$a_\iota = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi}}\, wo-\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{-t^2}\sigma_t^\varphi(b_\iota)\,dt\,,$$

$\{a_\iota\}_\iota$ is an increasing net in M^+ such that every orbit

$$\mathbb{R} \ni s \longmapsto \sigma_s^\varphi(a_\iota) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi}}\, wo-\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{-(t-s)^2}\sigma_t^\varphi(b_\iota)\,dt \in M$$

has an entire extension

$$\mathbb{C} \ni z \longmapsto \sigma_z^\varphi(a_\iota) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi}}\, wo-\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{-(t-z)^2}\sigma_t^\varphi(b_\iota)\,dt \in M\,.$$

Clearly, $\sigma_z^\varphi(a_\iota)^* = \sigma_{\overline{z}}^\varphi(a_\iota)$ for all ι and $z \in \mathbb{C}$. Since, for every $z \in \mathbb{C}$, the function

$$\mathbb{R} \ni t \longmapsto e^{-(t-z)^2} = e^{-(t-\Re z)^2 + (\Im z)^2} e^{2\,i\,(t-\Re z)\,\Im z}$$

is of the form $f_1 - f_2 + i\,(f_3 - f_4)$ with $0 \le f_j \in L^1(\mathbb{R})$, $1 \le j \le 4$, using (2.6) we deduce easily that

$$\sigma_z^\varphi(a_\iota) \in \mathfrak{M}_\varphi \ \text{ and } \ \|\sigma_z^\varphi(a_\iota)\| \le e^{(\Im z)^2} \ \text{ for all } \iota \text{ and } z \in \mathbb{C}\,.$$

On the other hand, $so-\lim\limits_\iota b_\iota = 1_H$ yields

$$so-\lim_\iota \sigma_z^\varphi(a_\iota) = 1_H \ \text{ for all } z \in \mathbb{C}\,.$$

$\square$

Proof of **Lemma 2.6**.

First we prove that

$$y \in \mathfrak{A}_\varphi \cap \mathrm{Dom}\,(\sigma^\varphi_{-\frac{i}{2}})\,,\ \sigma^\varphi_{-\frac{i}{2}}(y) \in \mathfrak{A}_\varphi \implies \sigma^\varphi_{-\frac{i}{2}}(y)_\varphi = J_\varphi\,(y^*)_\varphi\,. \tag{4.1}$$

For let $x \in \mathfrak{A}_\varphi$ be arbitrary. Then (2.5) yields

$$\sigma^\varphi_{-\frac{i}{2}}(y)\,J_\varphi\,x_\varphi = J_\varphi\,x\,J_\varphi\,\sigma^\varphi_{-\frac{i}{2}}(y)_\varphi\,. \tag{4.2}$$

On the other hand, since $J_\varphi\, x_\varphi = J_\varphi\, S_\varphi(x^*)_\varphi = \Delta_\varphi^{\frac{1}{2}}\,(x^*)_\varphi \in \mathrm{Dom}\,(\Delta_\varphi^{-\frac{1}{2}})$, using Theorem 2.3 we obtain

$$\sigma^\varphi_{-\frac{i}{2}}(y)\, J_\varphi\, x_\varphi = \Delta_\varphi^{\frac{1}{2}}\, y\, \Delta_\varphi^{-\frac{1}{2}}\, J_\varphi\, x_\varphi = \Delta_\varphi^{\frac{1}{2}}\,(y\, x^*)_\varphi = J_\varphi\, S_\varphi(y\, x^*)_\varphi = J_\varphi\, x\,(y^*)_\varphi \tag{4.3}$$

Now, (4.2) and (4.3) imply

$$J_\varphi\, x\, J_\varphi\, \sigma^\varphi_{-\frac{i}{2}}(y)_\varphi = J_\varphi\, x\,(y^*)_\varphi\,, \qquad x \in \mathfrak{A}_\varphi$$

and by the *so*-density of $\mathfrak{A}_\varphi$ in $M \ni 1_H$ we conclude that $\sigma^\varphi_{-\frac{i}{2}}(y)_\varphi = J_\varphi\,(y^*)_\varphi\,.$

(1) If $x \in \mathfrak{N}_\varphi$, then by (2.5)

$$\|x\, J_\varphi\, y_\varphi\| = \|J_\varphi\, y\, J_\varphi\, x_\varphi\| \leq \|y\|\, \|x_\varphi\|\,, \qquad y \in \mathfrak{N}_\varphi \supset \mathfrak{M}_\varphi\,.$$

Conversely, assume that $x \in M$ and $c \geq 0$ are such that

$$\|x\, J_\varphi\, y_\varphi\| \leq c\, \|y\|\,, \qquad y \in \mathfrak{M}_\varphi\,. \tag{4.4}$$

Let $\{a_\iota\}_\iota$ be a net as in Lemma 2.5. Then we have for every ι

$$\|\sigma^\varphi_{-\frac{i}{2}}(a_\iota)^* x^* x\, \sigma^\varphi_{-\frac{i}{2}}(a_\iota)\| \leq \|x\|^2 \|\sigma^\varphi_{-\frac{i}{2}}(a_\iota)\|^2 \leq \|x\|^2 e^{1/2}$$

and, according to (4.1) and (4.4),

$$\varphi\big(\sigma^\varphi_{-\frac{i}{2}}(a_\iota)^* x^* x\, \sigma^\varphi_{-\frac{i}{2}}(a_\iota)\big) = \|\, x\, \sigma^\varphi_{-\frac{i}{2}}(a_\iota)_\varphi\|^2 = \|\, x\, J_\varphi\,(a_\iota)_\varphi\|^2 \leq c^2\, \|a_\iota\|^2 \leq c^2\,.$$

Since $\sigma^\varphi_{-\frac{i}{2}}(a_\iota)^* x^* x\, \sigma^\varphi_{-\frac{i}{2}}(a_\iota) = \sigma^\varphi_{\frac{i}{2}}(a_\iota)\, x^* x\, \sigma^\varphi_{-\frac{i}{2}}(a_\iota) \xrightarrow{\ \iota\ } x^* x$ in the *so*-topology and φ is lower *wo*-semi-continuous on the bounded subsets of M^+, it follows that

$$\varphi(x^* x) \leq c^2\,, \text{ that is } x \in \mathfrak{N}_\varphi \text{ and } \|x_\varphi\| \leq c\,.$$

(2) Since the implication "$\Longrightarrow$" is an immediate consequence of (2.5), we have to prove only the converse implication. For let $x \in M$ and $\xi \in H$ be such that

$$x\, J_\varphi\, y_\varphi = J_\varphi\, y\, J_\varphi\, \xi\,, \qquad y \in \mathfrak{M}_\varphi\,. \tag{4.5}$$

Then (4.4) holds with $c = \|\xi\|$, so by the above part of the proof we have $x \in \mathfrak{N}_\varphi$. But then (2.5) and (4.5) yield

$$J_\varphi\, y\, J_\varphi\, x_\varphi = x\, J_\varphi\, y_\varphi = J_\varphi\, y\, J_\varphi\, \xi\,,$$

so by the *so*-density of $\mathfrak{M}_\varphi$ in $M \ni 1_H$ we conclude that $x_\varphi = \xi\,.$

□

Proof of **Proposition 2.7**.

(1) Let $\mathcal{D}$ be the linear span of $\{J_\varphi\, a^* J_\varphi\, b_\varphi\, ;\, a\,,\, b \in \mathfrak{N}_\varphi\}$, which is dense in H. Define the linear functional $F : \mathcal{D} \longrightarrow \mathbb{C}$ by

$$F(\eta) = \lim_\iota\,(\eta \,|\, (x_\iota)_\varphi)\,, \qquad \eta \in \mathcal{D}\,,$$

where the limit exists due to the convergence

$$\begin{aligned}(J_\varphi\, a^* J_\varphi\, b_\varphi \,|\, (x_\iota)_\varphi) = (b_\varphi \,|\, J_\varphi\, a\, J_\varphi\,(x_\iota)_\varphi) &\overset{(2.5)}{=} (b_\varphi \,|\, x_\iota\, J_\varphi\, a_\varphi) \\ &\xrightarrow{\ \iota\ } (b_\varphi \,|\, x\, J_\varphi\, a_\varphi)\,.\end{aligned} \tag{4.6}$$

Since F is bounded by

$$\|F\| \leq \sup_\iota\, \|(x_\iota)_\varphi\| < \infty\,,$$

it extends to a continuous linear functional on H , and hence there exists $\xi \in H$ satisfying $F(\eta) = (\eta \,|\, \xi)$ for all $\eta \in \mathcal{D}$. In particular, by (4.6),

$$(b_\varphi \,|\, x\, J_\varphi\, a_\varphi) = F(J_\varphi\, a^* J_\varphi\, b_\varphi) = (J_\varphi\, a^* J_\varphi\, b_\varphi \,|\, \xi) = (b_\varphi \,|\, J_\varphi\, a\, J_\varphi\, \xi)\,, \qquad a\,,\, b \in \mathfrak{N}_\varphi\,.$$

This implies that $x\, J_\varphi\, a_\varphi = J_\varphi\, a\, J_\varphi\, \xi$ for all $a \in \mathfrak{N}_\varphi$ and by Lemma 2.6.(2) we get

$$x \in \mathfrak{N}_\varphi \ \text{ and } \ x_\varphi = \xi\,.$$

Furthermore,

$$\lim_\iota\, (\eta \,|\, (x_\iota)_\varphi) = F(\eta) = (\eta \,|\, \xi) = (\eta \,|\, x_\varphi)\,, \qquad \eta \in \mathcal{D}\,,$$

the density of $\mathcal{D}$ in H and the boundedness of the net $\{(x_\iota)_\varphi\}_\iota$ yield that

$$(x_\iota)_\varphi \xrightarrow{\ \iota\ } x_\varphi \ \text{ in the weak topology of } H\,.$$

(2) Let $x \in M$ be any *wo*-limit point of the bounded net $\{x_\iota\}_\iota$. Then, for every $a \in \mathfrak{N}_\varphi$, $x\, J_\varphi\, a_\varphi$ is a weak limit point of the net $\{x_\iota\, J_\varphi\, a_\varphi\}_\iota \overset{(2.5)}{=} \{J_\varphi\, a\, J_\varphi\, (x_\iota)_\varphi\}_\iota$. Since $(x_\iota)_\varphi \xrightarrow{\ \iota\ } \xi$, we deduce

$$x\, J_\varphi\, a_\varphi = J_\varphi\, a\, J_\varphi\, \xi\,, \qquad a \in \mathfrak{N}_\varphi$$

and, using Lemma 2.6.(2), we obtain

$$x \in \mathfrak{N}_\varphi \ \text{ and } \ x_\varphi = \xi\,.$$

By the injectivity of the mapping $\mathfrak{N}_\varphi \ni y \longmapsto y_\varphi$, the uniqueness of the *wo*-limit point x of $\{x_\iota\}_\iota$ follows and we conclude that $wo - \lim\limits_\iota x_\iota = x$.

□

Proof of **Proposition 2.8**.

First we show that every $y \in \mathfrak{A}_\varphi$ can be approximated by a sequence $\{y_n\}_{n\geq 1}$ in $\mathfrak{T}_\varphi$ as required in the statement and such that (2.29) holds for $x = y_n$, $n \geq 1$.

Set

$$y_n = \sqrt{\frac{n}{\pi}}\; wo - \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{-nt^2} \sigma_t^\varphi(y)\, dt\,, \qquad n \geq 1\,.$$

Then every orbit

$$\mathbb{R} \ni s \longmapsto \sigma_s^\varphi(y_n) = \sqrt{\frac{n}{\pi}}\; wo - \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{-n(t-s)^2} \sigma_t^\varphi(y)\, dt \in M$$

has the entire extension

$$\mathbb{C} \ni z \longmapsto \sigma_z^\varphi(y_n) = \sqrt{\frac{n}{\pi}}\; wo - \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{-n(t-z)^2} \sigma_t^\varphi(y)\, dt \in M \tag{4.7}$$

and by (2.27) we have $\sigma_z^\varphi(y_n) \in \mathfrak{N}_\varphi$ for every $z \in \mathbb{C}$. Similarly,

$$\mathbb{R} \ni s \longmapsto \sigma_s^\varphi(y_n^*) = \sqrt{\frac{n}{\pi}}\; wo - \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{-n(t-s)^2} \sigma_t^\varphi(y^*)\, dt \in M$$

has an entire extension $\mathbb{C} \ni z \longmapsto \sigma_z^\varphi(y_n^*)$ and $\sigma_z^\varphi(y_n^*) \in \mathfrak{N}_\varphi$ for every $z \in \mathbb{C}$. Since $\sigma_z^\varphi(y_n)^* = \sigma_{\overline{z}}^\varphi(y_n^*)$, we have

$$\sigma_z^\varphi(y_n) \in (\mathfrak{N}_\varphi)^* \cap \mathfrak{N}_\varphi = \mathfrak{A}_\varphi\,, \qquad n \geq 1\,,\, z \in \mathbb{C}\,,$$

that is $y_n \in \mathfrak{T}_\varphi$ for all $n \geq 1$. By the *so*-continuity of $\mathbb{R} \ni t \longmapsto \sigma_t^\varphi(y) \in M$ and $\mathbb{R} \ni t \longmapsto \sigma_t^\varphi(y^*) \in M$ we get $y_n \xrightarrow{so} y$ and $y_n^* \xrightarrow{so} y^*$, while using

$$\big|\, e^{-n(t-z)^2} \big| = \big|\, e^{-n(t-\Re z)^2} e^{n(\Im z)^2} e^{2\, n\, i (t-\Re z)\, \Im z} \big| = e^{-n(t-\Re z)^2} e^{n(\Im z)^2} \tag{4.8}$$

it is easily seen that $\|\sigma^{\varphi}_{z}(y_n)\| \le e^{n(\Im z)^2}\|y\|$ for all $n \ge 1$ and $z \in \mathbb{C}$.

On the other hand, by (2.27) we have

$$(y_n)_\varphi = \sqrt{\frac{n}{\pi}}\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{-nt^2}\Delta_\varphi^{it}\, y_\varphi\, dt\,, \quad (y_n^*)_\varphi = \sqrt{\frac{n}{\pi}}\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{-nt^2}\Delta_\varphi^{it}\,(y^*)_\varphi\, dt$$

and by the norm-continuity of $\mathbb{R} \ni t \longmapsto \Delta_\varphi^{it}\, y_\varphi \in H$ and $\mathbb{R} \ni t \longmapsto \Delta_\varphi^{it}\,(y^*)_\varphi \in H$ we get the convergences $(y_n)_\varphi \longrightarrow y_\varphi$ and $(y_n^*)_\varphi \longrightarrow (y^*)_\varphi$ in the norm-topology. Furthermore, every orbit

$$\mathbb{R} \ni s \longmapsto \Delta_\varphi^{is}\,(y_n)_\varphi = \sqrt{\frac{n}{\pi}}\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{-n(t-s)^2}\Delta_\varphi^{it}\, y_\varphi\, dt \in H$$

has the entire extension

$$\mathbb{C} \ni z \longmapsto \sqrt{\frac{n}{\pi}}\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{-n(t-z)^2}\Delta_\varphi^{it}\, y_\varphi\, dt \in H$$

and thus (see [28], Lemma 3.2 and [12], Theorem 6.1) $(y_n)_\varphi \in \bigcap\limits_{z\in\mathbb{C}} \operatorname{Dom}\Delta_\varphi^{iz}$ and

$$\Delta_\varphi^{iz}\,(y_n)_\varphi = \sqrt{\frac{n}{\pi}}\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{-n(t-z)^2}\Delta_\varphi^{it}\, y_\varphi\, dt\,, \qquad z \in \mathbb{C}\,. \tag{4.9}$$

Similarly, $(y_n^*)_\varphi \in \bigcap\limits_{z\in\mathbb{C}} \operatorname{Dom}\Delta_\varphi^{iz}$ and

$$\Delta_\varphi^{iz}\,(y_n^*)_\varphi = \sqrt{\frac{n}{\pi}}\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{-n(t-z)^2}\Delta_\varphi^{it}\,(y^*)_\varphi\, dt\,, \qquad z \in \mathbb{C}\,.$$

Moreover, using (4.8), we get for every $n \ge 1$ and $z \in \mathbb{C}$

$$\|\Delta_\varphi^{iz}\,(y_n)_\varphi\| \le e^{n(\Im z)^2}\|y_\varphi\|\,, \quad \|\Delta_\varphi^{iz}\,(y_n^*)_\varphi\| \le e^{n(\Im z)^2}\|(y^*)_\varphi\|\,.$$

Finally, for every $n \ge 1$, (4.7), (2.27) and (4.9) yield

$$\sigma^\varphi_z(y_n)_\varphi = \sqrt{\frac{n}{\pi}}\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{-n(t-z)^2}\sigma^\varphi_t(y)_\varphi\, dt = \Delta_\varphi^{iz}\,(y_n)_\varphi\,, \qquad z \in \mathbb{C}\,, \tag{4.10}$$

hence (2.29) holds for $x = y_n$.

It remains to prove that (2.29) holds in full generality. First we show that

$$x \in \mathfrak{T}_\varphi\,,\ z \in \mathbb{C}\,,\ x_\varphi \in \operatorname{Dom}(\Delta_\varphi^{iz}) \implies \sigma^\varphi_z(x)_\varphi = \Delta_\varphi^{iz}\, x_\varphi\,. \tag{4.11}$$

By Lemma 2.6 this is equivalent to the implication

$$x \in \mathfrak{T}_\varphi\,,\ z \in \mathbb{C}\,,\ x_\varphi \in \operatorname{Dom}(\Delta_\varphi^{iz})\,,\ y \in \mathfrak{A}_\varphi \implies \sigma^\varphi_z(x)\, J_\varphi\, y_\varphi = J_\varphi\, y\, J_\varphi\, \Delta_\varphi^{iz}\, x_\varphi\,,$$

what we now are going to prove. Choose a sequence $\{y_n\}_{n\ge1}$ in $\mathfrak{T}_\varphi$ as in the above part of the proof. For each $n \ge 1$, $(y_n)_\varphi \in \operatorname{Dom}(\Delta_\varphi^{-i\,\overline{z}})$ implies by (2.1) that

$$J_\varphi\,(y_n)_\varphi \in \operatorname{Dom}(\Delta_\varphi^{-iz}) \text{ and } \Delta_\varphi^{-iz}J_\varphi\,(y_n)_\varphi = J_\varphi\,\Delta_\varphi^{-i\,\overline{z}}\,(y_n)_\varphi\,,$$

so, according to Theorem 2.3,

$$\begin{aligned} &x\,\Delta_\varphi^{-iz}J_\varphi\,(y_n)_\varphi = x\,J_\varphi\,\Delta_\varphi^{-i\,\overline{z}}\,(y_n)_\varphi \in \operatorname{Dom}(\Delta_\varphi^{iz}) \text{ and} \\ &\sigma^\varphi_z(x)\,J_\varphi\,(y_n)_\varphi = \Delta_\varphi^{iz}\,x\,\Delta_\varphi^{-iz}J_\varphi\,(y_n)_\varphi = \Delta_\varphi^{iz}\,x\,J_\varphi\,\Delta_\varphi^{-i\,\overline{z}}\,(y_n)_\varphi\,. \end{aligned} \tag{4.12}$$

Since, by (4.10) and by (2.5),

$$x\,J_\varphi\,\Delta_\varphi^{-i\,\overline{z}}\,(y_n)_\varphi = x\,J_\varphi\,\sigma^\varphi_{-\overline{z}}(y_n)_\varphi = J_\varphi\,\sigma^\varphi_{-\overline{z}}(y_n)\,J_\varphi\,x_\varphi\,,$$

(4.12) yields

$$J_\varphi\, \sigma^\varphi_{-\overline{z}}(y_n)\, J_\varphi\, x_\varphi \in \mathrm{Dom}\,(\Delta_\varphi^{iz}) \ \text{ and } \ \sigma^\varphi_z(x)\, J_\varphi\, (y_n)_\varphi = \Delta_\varphi^{iz}\, J_\varphi\, \sigma^\varphi_{-\overline{z}}(y_n)\, J_\varphi\, x_\varphi\,.$$

Using again (2.1), we obtain

$$\sigma^\varphi_{-\overline{z}}(y_n)\, J_\varphi\, x_\varphi \in \mathrm{Dom}\,(\Delta_\varphi^{i\overline{z}}) \ \text{ and } \ \sigma^\varphi_z(x)\, J_\varphi\, (y_n)_\varphi = J_\varphi\, \Delta_\varphi^{i\overline{z}}\, \sigma^\varphi_{-\overline{z}}(y_n)\, J_\varphi\, x_\varphi\,. \quad (4.13)$$

Taking into account that $x_\varphi \in \mathrm{Dom}\,(\Delta_\varphi^{iz})$ and, by Theorem 2.3 and by (2.1),

$$J_\varphi\, \Delta_\varphi^{i\overline{z}}\, \sigma^\varphi_{-\overline{z}}(y_n)\, J_\varphi \supset J_\varphi\, y_n\, \Delta_\varphi^{i\overline{z}}\, J_\varphi \supset J_\varphi\, y_n\, J_\varphi\, \Delta_\varphi^{iz}\,,$$

(4.13) implies the equality $\sigma^\varphi_z(x)\, J_\varphi\, (y_n)_\varphi = J_\varphi\, y_n\, J_\varphi\, \Delta_\varphi^{iz}\, x_\varphi$. Passing now to the limit for $n \to \infty$, we conclude that

$$\sigma^\varphi_z(x)\, J_\varphi\, y_\varphi = J_\varphi\, y\, J_\varphi\, \Delta_\varphi^{iz}\, x_\varphi\,.$$

Next we show by induction on k that

$$x \in \mathfrak{T}_\varphi \implies x_\varphi \in \mathrm{Dom}\left(\Delta_\varphi^{\frac{k}{2}}\right) \quad (4.14)$$

holds for every integer $k \geq 1$. Indeed,

$$x \in \mathfrak{T}_\varphi \subset \mathfrak{A}_\varphi \implies x_\varphi \in \mathrm{Dom}\,(S_\varphi) = \mathrm{Dom}\left(\Delta_\varphi^{\frac{1}{2}}\right)$$

is clear and if (4.14) holds for some $k \geq 1$ and $x \in \mathfrak{T}_\varphi$, then we have by (4.11)

$$\Delta_\varphi^{\frac{k}{2}}\, x_\varphi = \sigma^\varphi_{-\frac{k}{2}i}(x)_\varphi \in \mathrm{Dom}\,(S_\varphi) = \mathrm{Dom}\left(\Delta_\varphi^{\frac{1}{2}}\right), \ \text{ that is } x_\varphi \in \mathrm{Dom}\left(\Delta_\varphi^{\frac{k+1}{2}}\right).$$

On the other hand, for every $x \in \mathfrak{T}_\varphi$ and $k \geq 1$ we have $\sigma^\varphi_{\frac{k}{2}i}(x) \in \mathfrak{T}_\varphi$, so (4.14) yields $\sigma^\varphi_{\frac{k}{2}i}(x)_\varphi \in \mathrm{Dom}\left(\Delta_\varphi^{\frac{k}{2}}\right)$ and, using (4.11), we deduce

$$x_\varphi = \sigma^\varphi_{-\frac{k}{2}i}\big(\sigma^\varphi_{\frac{k}{2}i}(x)\big)_\varphi = \Delta_\varphi^{\frac{k}{2}}\, \sigma^\varphi_{\frac{k}{2}i}(x)_\varphi \in \mathrm{Dom}\left(\Delta_\varphi^{-\frac{k}{2}}\right).$$

Therefore (4.14) holds also for every integer $k \leq -1$ that is $\mathfrak{T}_\varphi \subset \bigcap\limits_{z\in\mathbb{C}} \mathrm{Dom}\,\Delta_\varphi^z$. This last inclusion together with (4.11) imply (2.29).

□

5. Hermitian Maps

In this section we analyse the notion introduced in Definition 2.10 by proving Lemma 2.9, Lemma 2.11 and Theorem 2.12.

Proof of **Lemma 2.9**.

Let $\xi \in \mathrm{Dom}\, S_\psi$ be arbitrary. Then there is a sequence $(x_n)_{n\geq 1}$ in $\mathfrak{A}_\psi$ such that

$$(x_n)_\psi \longrightarrow \xi\,, \qquad (x_n^*)_\psi \longrightarrow S_\psi\, \xi\,.$$

Then, denoting

$$\xi_+ = \frac{1}{2}\,(\xi + S_\psi\, \xi)\,, \qquad \xi_- = \frac{1}{2\,i}\,(\xi - S_\psi\, \xi)\,, \qquad a_n = \frac{1}{2}\,(x_n + x_n^*)\,,$$

we have

$$\xi = \xi_+ + i\, \xi_-\,, \qquad S_\psi\, \xi_\pm = \xi_\pm\,, \ \text{ i.e. } \ \xi_\pm \in K^{S_\psi}\,, \quad (5.1)$$

$$a_n^* = a_n \in \mathfrak{N}_\psi\,, \qquad (a_n)_\psi \longrightarrow \xi_+\,. \quad (5.2)$$

Since $\xi_+ = \xi$ if $\xi \in K^{S_\psi}$, (5.2) implies that $K^{S_\psi} \subset \overline{\{x_\psi\, ;\, x^* = x \in \mathfrak{N}_\psi\}}$. The converse inclusion being trivial, the equality $K^{S_\psi} = \overline{\{x_\psi\, ;\, x^* = x \in \mathfrak{N}_\psi\}}$ follows. On the other hand, (5.1) implies that $\operatorname{Dom} S_\psi = K^{S_\psi} + i\, K^{S_\psi}$. This proves (1) and (4) in Lemma 2.9.

For (2) and (3) we first notice that, for every $\xi \in K^{S_\psi}$ and $x \in \mathfrak{A}_\psi$,

$$(\xi \,|\, J_\psi\, x_\psi) = (\xi \,|\, J_\psi\, S_\psi\, (x^*)_\psi) = (\xi \,|\, \Delta_\psi^{1/2} (x^*)_\psi) = (\Delta_\psi^{1/2} \xi \,|\, (x^*)_\psi) = (J_\psi\, (x^*)_\psi \,|\, \xi)\, .$$

In particular, $(\xi \,|\, J_\psi\, x_\psi) \in \mathbb{R}$ whenever $x = x^*$.

Conversely, let us assume that $\xi \in K$ is such that $(\xi \,|\, J_\psi\, x_\psi) \in \mathbb{R}$ if $x^* = x \in \mathfrak{N}_\psi$. For every $x \in \mathfrak{A}_\psi$ we have

$$a = \frac{1}{2}\,(x + x^*)\, ,\; b = \frac{1}{2\,i}\,(x - x^*) \in \mathfrak{A}_\psi \;\text{ are selfadjoint and }\; x = a + i\, b\, ,$$

hence, by our assumption on ξ ,

$$\begin{aligned}(\xi \,|\, J_\psi\, x_\psi) &= \frac{1}{2}\big((\xi \,|\, J_\psi\, a_\psi) + i\,(\xi \,|\, J_\psi\, b_\psi)\big) = \frac{1}{2}\big((J_\psi\, a_\psi \,|\, \xi) + i\,(J_\psi\, b_\psi \,|\, \xi)\big) = \\ &= \big(J_\psi\, \frac{1}{2}\,(a - i\, b)_\psi \,|\, \xi\big) = (J_\psi\, (x^*)_\psi \,|\, \xi)\, .\end{aligned}$$

It follows that $(x_\psi \,|\, J_\psi\, \xi) = (\, \Delta_\psi^{1/2}\, x_\psi \,|\, \xi)$ for all $x \in \mathfrak{A}_\psi$, hence, $\{x_\psi\, ;\, x \in \mathfrak{A}_\psi\}$ being a core of $\Delta_\psi^{1/2}$, ξ belongs to the domain of $(\Delta_\psi^{1/2})^* = \Delta_\psi^{1/2}$ and $\Delta_\psi^{1/2}\, \xi = J_\psi\, \xi$. In other words, $\xi \in \operatorname{Dom} S_\psi$ and $S_\psi\, \xi = J_\psi\, \Delta_\psi^{1/2}\, \xi = \xi$, i.e. $\xi \in K^{S_\psi}$.

□

Proof of **Lemma 2.11**.

If $T \in B(K, H)$ implements ψ in φ and $x^* = x \in \mathfrak{N}_\psi$, then

$$T\, x_\psi = (T\, x\, T^*)_\varphi \;\text{ with }\; (T\, x\, T^*)^* = T\, x\, T^* \in \mathfrak{N}_\varphi$$

and hence Lemma 2.9.(1) implies $T\, K^{S_\psi} \subset H^{S_\varphi}$, proving (1). In this case the inclusion $T\, \mathfrak{N}_\psi\, T^* \subset \mathfrak{N}_\varphi$ and the *wo*-density of $\mathfrak{N}_\psi$ in N imply $T\, N\, T^* \subset M$, proving (2).

If T is isometric in addition, then

$$x = T^*(T\, x\, T^*)\, T\, , \qquad x \in N$$

shows the injectivity of the map $N \ni x \longmapsto T\, x\, T^* \in M$, which is clearly also a $*$-homomorphism. Furthermore, $0 \leq a \in \mathfrak{M}_\psi$ implies $a^{1/2} \in \mathfrak{N}_\psi$ and

$$\psi(a) = \|(a^{1/2})_\psi\|^2 = \|T\,(a^{1/2})_\psi\|^2 = \|(T\, a^{1/2}\, T^*)_\varphi\|^2 = \varphi(T\, a\, T^*)\, .$$

Therefore (3) holds.

Let us finally assume that ψ and φ are bounded and $\xi_\psi = (1_K)_\psi$, $\eta_\varphi = (1_H)_\varphi$. If $T \in B(K, H)$ is injective and implements ψ in φ , then $T\, N\, T^* \subset M$ by the above proved (2) and

$$T\, T^* \eta_\varphi = (T\, 1_K\, T^*)_\varphi = T\,(1_K)_\psi = T\, \xi_\psi \quad \Longrightarrow \quad T^* \eta_\varphi = \xi_\psi$$

by the injectivity of T . Conversely, if $T \in B(K, H)$ is injective and satisfies $T\, N\, T^* \subset M$ and $T^* \eta_\varphi = \xi_\psi$, then for $x \in N$

$$(T\, x\, T^*)_\varphi = T\, x\, T^* \eta_\varphi = T\, x\, \xi_\psi = T\, x_\psi\, .$$

Hence we have (4).

□

Proof of **Theorem 2.12**.

(1), (2) and (3) in Lemma 2.9 imply the equivalences (1) ⇔ (2), (2) ⇔ (3) and (2) ⇔ (4), respectively.

Let us assume that (1) holds. By (4) in Lemma 2.9, every $\xi \in \mathrm{Dom}\, S_\psi$ is of the form $\xi = \xi_1 + i\,\xi_2$ with $\xi_1\,,\ \xi_2 \in K^{S_\psi}$. Hence we get

$$\begin{aligned} &T(\xi) = T(\xi_1) + i\,T(\xi_2) \in H^{S_\varphi} + i\,H^{S_\varphi} \subset \mathrm{Dom}\, S_\varphi\,,\\ &S_\varphi\big(T(\xi)\big) = T(\xi_1) - i\,T(\xi_2) = T(\xi_1 - i\,\xi_2) = T\big(S_\psi(\xi)\big)\,,\end{aligned}$$

proving (5). Conversely, if (5) holds, then we have for every $\xi \in K^{S_\psi} \subset \mathrm{Dom}\, S_\psi$

$$T\,(\xi) \in \mathrm{Dom}\, S_\varphi \ \text{ and } \ S_\varphi\big(T(\xi)\big) = T\big(S_\psi(\xi)\big) = T(\xi)\,,$$

so $T(\xi) \in H^{S_\varphi}$. Therefore (1) ⇔ (5).

Since J_ψ is involutive and, by (2.2), $S_\psi = \Delta_\psi^{-1/2}\, J_\psi$ and $S_\varphi = \Delta_\varphi^{-1/2}\, J_\varphi$, (5) is equivalent to

$$T\,\Delta_\psi^{-1/2} \subset \Delta_\varphi^{-1/2}\, J_\varphi\, T\, J_\psi\,.$$

This equation, in turn, is equivalent to the validity of

$$\Delta_\varphi^{1/2}\, T\,\Delta_\psi^{-1/2}\xi = J_\varphi\, T\, J_\psi\,\xi\,, \qquad \xi \in \mathrm{Dom}\,\Delta_\psi^{-1/2}$$

and thus (5) ⇔ (6).

We have already seen that (1) ⇔ (3). Applying this equivalence to $J_\psi\, T^* J_\varphi$, it follows that $J_\psi\, T^* J_\varphi$ is Hermitian with respect to (φ, ψ) if and only if

$$(J_\psi\, T^* J_\varphi\, y_\varphi \,|\, J_\psi x_\psi) = (x_\psi \,|\, T^* J_\varphi\, y_\varphi) = (T\, x_\psi \,|\, J_\varphi\, y_\varphi)$$

is real for all $x^* = x \in \mathfrak{N}_\psi$ and $y^* = y \in \mathfrak{N}_\varphi$. But this means exactly (3), so (3) ⇔ (7).

By the equivalence of statements (1) and (5) in Theorem 2.3 with $A = \Delta_\varphi$, $B = \Delta_\psi$, $\beta = -\frac{1}{2}$, and taking into account that they imply (2.24) and (2.25), we obtain the equivalence (6) ⇔ (8).

Now let us assume that the equivalent conditions (1) – (8) are satisfied. Then, by (2.26) in Theorem 2.3, we get (2.32). Further, using (2.2), we obtain (2.33) immediately from (2.32) and (2.30). Since the map $T(\,\cdot\,)$ is bounded and

$$\|T(s)\| = \|\Delta_\varphi^{is}\, T\,\Delta_\psi^{-is}\| = \|T\|\,,\ \left\|T\Big(s - \frac{i}{2}\Big)\right\| \overset{(2.33)}{=} \|J_\varphi\, T(s)\, J_\psi\| = \|T\|\,, \qquad s \in \mathbb{R}\,,$$

we get also (2.31) by the Three Line Theorem. Finally, since K^{S_ψ} and H^{S_φ} are invariant under Δ_ψ^{-is} and Δ_φ^{is}, respectively, for every $s \in \mathbb{R}$, due to (2.3) and Lemma 2.9.(1), we obtain the Hermiticity of $T(s) = \Delta_\varphi^{is}\, T\,\Delta_\psi^{-is}$ from (1).

□

6. Generalization of the Structure Theorem of Borchers

We prove Theorem 2.13 in two steps: first we prove it for the case where Ξ_o and Ξ_1 are empty, and then we reduce the proof of the general case to the above special case.

Step 1. Proof in the case of $\Xi_o = \Xi_1 = \emptyset$ and *wo*-continuous $T(\,\cdot\,)$.

By our assumptions in this step,

$$\overline{\mathbb{S}_\beta} \ni z \longmapsto T(z) \in B(K,H)$$

is a bounded *wo*-continuous map which is analytic in $\mathbb{S}_\beta$ and satisfies the boundary conditions

(i) $T(s)$ is Hermitian with respect to (ψ,φ) for all $s \in \mathbb{R}$,
(ii) $J_\varphi\, T(s+i\beta)\, J_\psi$ is Hermitian with respect to (ψ,φ) for all $s \in \mathbb{R}$.

Let $x \in \mathfrak{T}_\psi$ and $y \in \mathfrak{T}_\varphi$ be arbitrary (for the Tomita algebras $\mathfrak{T}_\psi$ and $\mathfrak{T}_\varphi$ see the comments before Proposition 2.8) such that

$$\|\Delta_\varphi^{iz}\, x_\varphi\| \le e^{c\,(\Im z)^2}\|x_\varphi\|\,,\ \|\Delta_\varphi^{iz}\, y_\varphi\| \le e^{c\,(\Im z)^2}\|y_\varphi\|\,, \qquad z \in \mathbb{C} \tag{6.1}$$

for some constant $c \ge 0$. Consider the functions

$$f_1 : \mathbb{C} \times \overline{\mathbb{S}_\beta} \ni (z_1, z_2) \longmapsto \big(T(z_2)\, \Delta_\psi^{-iz_1}\, x_\psi \,|\, J_\varphi\, \Delta_\varphi^{-iz_1}\, y_\varphi\big)\,,$$

$$f_2 : \mathbb{C} \times \overline{\mathbb{S}_{-\beta}} \ni (z_1, z_2) \longmapsto \big(\Delta_\varphi^{-iz_1+\frac{1}{2}}\, y_\varphi \,|\, T(\overline{z_2})\, J_\psi\, \Delta_\psi^{-iz_1+\frac{1}{2}}\, x_\psi\big)\,.$$

They are continuous and, according to (6.1), bounded on any set of the form

$$\{z_1 \in \mathbb{C}\,;\, |\Im z_1| \le \delta\} \times \overline{\mathbb{S}_\beta} \ \text{ and } \{z_1 \in \mathbb{C}\,;\, |\Im z_1| \le \delta\} \times \overline{\mathbb{S}_{-\beta}}\,, \ \text{ respectively }, \quad \delta > 0\,.$$

Furthermore, the partial functions

$$\mathbb{C} \ni z_1 \longmapsto f_1(z_1,z_2)\,, \quad z_2 \in \overline{\mathbb{S}_\beta}\,, \qquad \mathbb{S}_\beta \ni z_2 \longmapsto f_1(z_1,z_2)\,, \quad z_1 \in \mathbb{C}\,,$$

$$\mathbb{C} \ni z_1 \longmapsto f_2(z_1,z_2)\,, \quad z_2 \in \overline{\mathbb{S}_{-\beta}}\,, \qquad \mathbb{S}_{-\beta} \ni z_2 \longmapsto f_2(z_1,z_2)\,, \quad z_1 \in \mathbb{C}$$

are analytic.

Now, by (2.29) and Theorem 2.12.(4), (i) implies, for every $z_1 \in \mathbb{C}$ and $s \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$\begin{aligned} f_1(z_1,s) &= \big(T(s)\, \sigma^\psi_{-z_1}(x)_\psi \,|\, J_\varphi\, \sigma^\varphi_{-z_1}(y)_\varphi\big) = \\ &= \big(J_\varphi \left(\sigma^\varphi_{-z_1}(y)^*\right)_\varphi \,|\, T(s) \left(\sigma^\psi_{-z_1}(x)^*\right)_\psi\big) = \\ &= \big(J_\varphi\, S_\varphi\, \sigma^\varphi_{-z_1}(y)_\varphi \,|\, T(s)\, S_\psi\, \sigma^\psi_{-z_1}(x)_\psi\big) = \\ &= \big(\Delta_\varphi^{-iz_1+\frac{1}{2}}\, y_\varphi \,|\, T(s)\, J_\psi\, \Delta_\psi^{-iz_1+\frac{1}{2}}\, x_\psi\big) = f_2(z_1,s)\,. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore

$$f : \mathbb{C} \times \big\{z_2 \in \mathbb{C}\,;\, |\Im z_2| \le |\beta|\big\} \ni (z_1,z_2) \ \longmapsto \begin{cases} f_1(z_1,z_2) & \text{if } z_2 \in \overline{\mathbb{S}_\beta}\,, \\ f_2(z_1,z_2) & \text{if } z_2 \in \overline{\mathbb{S}_{-\beta}} \end{cases}$$

is a well defined continuous function, bounded on every set of the form

$$\big\{z_1 \in \mathbb{C}\,;\, |\Im z_1| \le \delta\big\} \times \big\{z_2 \in \mathbb{C}\,;\, |\Im z_2| \le |\beta|\big\}\,, \qquad \delta > 0\,.$$

For each fixed $z_1 \in \mathbb{C}$, the function $\mathbb{S}_\beta \cup \mathbb{S}_{-\beta} \ni z_2 \longmapsto f(z_1,z_2)$ is analytic. Hence, by the Morera Theorem (the one-dimensional edge-of-the-wedge theorem, see for example [3], 2.1.9.(2) or [11], II.2.7), it can be analytically extended across $\mathbb{R}$, that is the partial functions

$$\big\{z_2 \in \mathbb{C}\,;\, |\Im z_2| < |\beta|\big\} \ni z_2 \ \longmapsto f(z_1,z_2)\,, \qquad z_1 \in \mathbb{C}$$

are analytic. Thus we can apply to f the Osgood Lemma (the Hartogs Theorem for continuous functions, see for example [18], Theorem I.A.2) and deduce that it is analytic, as function of two complex variables, on $\mathbb{C} \times \big\{z_2 \in \mathbb{C}\,;\, |\Im z_2| < |\beta|\big\}$.

For every $z_1 \in \mathbb{C}$ and $s \in \mathbb{R}$, (ii) implies by (2.29) and Theorem 2.12.(4),

$$\begin{aligned} f\Big(z_1 + \frac{i}{2}\,,\, s + i\,\beta\Big) &= f_1\Big(z_1 + \frac{i}{2}\,,\, s + i\,\beta\Big) = \\ &= \big(T(s+i\beta)\, J_\psi\, S_\psi \Delta_\psi^{-iz_1}\, x_\psi \,|\, S_\varphi\, \Delta_\varphi^{-iz_1}\, y_\varphi\big) = \\ &= \big(T(s+i\beta)\, J_\psi\, \big(\sigma^\psi_{-z_1}(x)^*\big)_\psi \,|\, \big(\sigma^\varphi_{-z_1}(y)^*\big)_\varphi\big) = \\ &= \big(J_\varphi\, \big(\sigma^\varphi_{-z_1}(y)^*\big)_\varphi \,|\, J_\varphi\, T(s+i\beta)\, J_\psi\, \big(\sigma^\psi_{-z_1}(x)^*\big)_\psi\big) = \\ &= \big(J_\varphi\, T(s+i\beta)\, J_\psi\, \sigma^\psi_{-z_1}(x)_\psi \,|\, J_\varphi\, \sigma^\varphi_{-z_1}(y)_\varphi\big) = \\ &= \big(\sigma^\varphi_{-z_1}(y)_\varphi \,|\, T(s+i\beta)\, J_\psi\, \sigma^\psi_{-z_1}(x)_\psi\big) = \\ &= \big(\Delta_\varphi^{-i(z_1 - \frac{i}{2}) + \frac{1}{2}}\, y_\varphi \,|\, T(\overline{s-i\beta})\, J_\psi\, \Delta_\psi^{-i(z_1 - \frac{i}{2}) + \frac{1}{2}}\, x_\psi\big) = \\ &= f_2\Big(z_1 - \frac{i}{2}\,,\, s - i\,\beta\Big) = f\Big(z_1 - \frac{i}{2}\,,\, s - i\,\beta\Big)\,. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, for each $s \in \mathbb{R}$, the bounded, continuous function

$$g_s : \Big\{\zeta \in \mathbb{C}\,;\, |\Im\zeta| \leq \frac{1}{2}\Big\} \ni \zeta \longmapsto f\big(\zeta\,,\, s + 2\,\beta\,\zeta\big)\,,$$

which is analytic in the interior, satisfies

$$g_s\Big(t + \frac{i}{2}\Big) = g_s\Big(t - \frac{i}{2}\Big)\,, \qquad t \in \mathbb{R}\,.$$

By the Morera Theorem, g_s extends to a periodic entire function with period i, still denoted by g_s, which is bounded. By the Liouville Theorem it follows that g_s is constant, hence we get successively

$$f_1(0\,,s) = f(0\,,s) = g_s(0) = g_s\Big(\frac{-s}{2\,\beta}\Big) = f\Big(\frac{-s}{2\,\beta}\,,\,0\Big) = f_1\Big(\frac{-s}{2\,\beta}\,,\,0\Big)\,,$$

$$\begin{aligned} \big(T(s)\, x_\psi \,|\, J_\varphi\, y_\varphi\big) = {} & \big(T(0)\, \Delta_\psi^{i\frac{s}{2\beta}}\, x_\psi \,|\, J_\varphi\, \Delta_\varphi^{i\frac{s}{2\beta}}\, y_\varphi\big) = \\ & \overset{(2.2)}{=} \big(\Delta_\varphi^{-i\frac{s}{2\beta}}\, T(0)\, \Delta_\psi^{i\frac{s}{2\beta}}\, x_\psi \,|\, J_\varphi\, y_\varphi\big)\,. \end{aligned}$$

By the density property of $\mathfrak{T}_\varphi$ stated in Proposition 2.8, the above equalities imply that

$$T(s) = \Delta_\varphi^{-i\frac{s}{2\beta}}\, T(0)\, \Delta_\psi^{i\frac{s}{2\beta}}\,, \qquad s \in \mathbb{R}\,,$$

hence (2.36) holds with $T = T(0)$. From (2.32) and (2.33) in Theorem 2.12, we obtain (2.37) and (2.38).

Step 2. PROOF IN THE GENERAL CASE.

Let us consider, for any integer $n \geq 1$, the entire function

$$\mathbb{C} \ni z \longmapsto f_n(z) = \sqrt{\frac{n}{\pi}}\, e^{-nz^2}$$

and the mollification of $T(\,\cdot\,)$

$$\overline{\mathbb{S}_\beta} \ni z \longmapsto T_n(z) = wo - \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} f_n(t)\, T(t+z)\, dt \in B(K, H)\,. \tag{6.2}$$

We notice that the mapping $\mathbb{R} \ni t \longmapsto T(t+z) \in B(K, H)$ is norm-continuous for $z \in \mathbb{S}_\beta$ and, due to the continuity conditions (2.34) and (2.35), *wo*-measurable with respect to the Lebesgue measure for $z \in \partial\,\mathbb{S}_\beta$. Since $T(\,\cdot\,)$ is bounded and $f_n(t)\,dt$ is a probability measure, the integrals in (6.2) exist and

$$\sup\{\,\|T_n(z)\|\,;\, z \in \overline{\mathbb{S}_\beta}\,,\, n \geq 1\} \leq \sup\{\,\|T(z)\|\,;\, z \in \mathbb{S}_\beta\} < \infty\,. \tag{6.3}$$

Further, (2.34) and (2.35) yield by the Lebesgue Dominated Convergence Theorem

$$T_n(s) = wo-\lim_{0<t/\beta\to 0} T_n(s+it)\,, \qquad s \in \mathbb{R}\,, \tag{6.4}$$

$$T_n(s+i\beta) = wo-\lim_{1>t/\beta\to 1} T_n(s+it)\,, \qquad s \in \mathbb{R}\,. \tag{6.5}$$

We compare the operator valued function $T_n(\,\cdot\,)$ with

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{C} \ni z \longmapsto T_{\zeta,n}(z) &= wo-\int_{\mathbb{R}+\zeta} f_n(w-z)\,T(w)\,dw \\ &= wo-\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} f_n(t+\zeta-z)\,T(t+\zeta)\,dt \in B(K,H)\,,\end{aligned} \tag{6.6}$$

where $\zeta \in \mathbb{S}_\beta$. Due to

$$f_n(t+\zeta-z) = \sqrt{\frac{n}{\pi}}\, e^{-nt^2}\, e^{-2nt(\zeta-z)-n(\zeta-z)^2}\,,$$

the integral in (6.6) is convergent and defines an entire mapping $T_{\zeta,n}(\,\cdot\,)$.

For ζ_1 , $\zeta_2 \in \mathbb{S}_\beta$ and $z \in \mathbb{C}$ we have by the Cauchy Integral Theorem

$$T_{\zeta_1,n}(z) = wo-\int_{\mathbb{R}+\zeta_1} f_n(w-z)\,T(w)\,dw = wo-\int_{\mathbb{R}+\zeta_2} f_n(w-z)\,T(w)\,dw = T_{\zeta_2,n}(z)\,,$$

so $T_{\zeta,n}(\,\cdot\,)$ does not depend on $\zeta \in \mathbb{S}_\beta$. Therefore, for any $\zeta \in \mathbb{S}_\beta$,

$$T_{\zeta,n}(z) = T_{z,n}(z) = T_n(z)\,, \qquad z \in \mathbb{S}_\beta\,. \tag{6.7}$$

Let $\zeta \in \mathbb{S}_\beta$ be arbitrary. Since $T_{\zeta,n}(\,\cdot\,)$ is an entire mapping, by (6.4), (6.5) and (6.7) we get for every $s \in \mathbb{R}$

$$T_n(s) = wo-\lim_{0<t/\beta\to 0} T_n(s+it) = wo-\lim_{0<t/\beta\to 0} T_{\zeta,n}(s+it) = T_{\zeta,n}(s)\,,$$

$$T_n(s+i\beta) = wo-\lim_{1>t/\beta\to 1} T_n(s+it) = wo-\lim_{1>t/\beta\to 1} T_{\zeta,n}(s+it) = T_{\zeta,n}(s+i\beta)\,.$$

Consequently, the mapping $\overline{\mathbb{S}_\beta} \ni z \longmapsto T_n(z)$ defined in (6.2) is a restriction of the entire mapping $T_{\zeta,n}(\,\cdot\,)$. In particular, it is *so*-continuous (the role of $T_{\zeta,n}(\,\cdot\,)$ is just to prove this statement) and its restriction to $\mathbb{S}_\beta$ is analytic. We recall that its boundedness was already noticed in (6.3).

Since $\mathbb{R} \ni t \longmapsto f_n(t)$ is a real function, (1) ⇔ (3) in Theorem 2.12 implies that the Hermiticity of $T(s)$ and $J_\varphi\, T(s+i\beta)\, J_\psi$ for $s \in \mathbb{R}\setminus \Xi_o$ respectively $s \in \mathbb{R}\setminus\Xi_1$ is inherited by $T_n(s)$ and $J_\varphi\, T_n(s+i\beta)\, J_\psi$ for all $s \in \mathbb{R}$.

Thus $T_n(\,\cdot\,)$ fulfils all the assumptions made in Step 1. Consequently there exists $T_n \in B(K,H)$ satisfying

$$T_n(s) = \Delta_\varphi^{-i\frac{s}{2\beta}}\, T_n\, \Delta_\psi^{i\frac{s}{2\beta}}\,, \qquad s \in \mathbb{R}\,.$$

It follows that

$$T_n(s+t) = \Delta_\varphi^{-i\frac{s}{2\beta}}\, T_n(t)\, \Delta_\psi^{i\frac{s}{2\beta}}\,, \qquad t\,,\ s \in \mathbb{R}\,,$$

which yields by analytic extension

$$T_n(z+s) = \Delta_\varphi^{-i\frac{s}{2\beta}}\, T_n(z)\, \Delta_\psi^{i\frac{s}{2\beta}}\,, \qquad z \in \overline{\mathbb{S}_\beta}\,,\ s \in \mathbb{R}\,. \tag{6.8}$$

On the other hand, from (6.2) we obtain

$$\text{norm} - \lim_{n\to\infty} T_n(z) = T(z)\,, \qquad z \in \mathbb{S}_\beta\,,$$

due to the boundedness and norm-continuity of $T(\,\cdot\,)$ in $\mathbb{S}_\beta$. Thus we get by (6.8)

$$T(z+s) = \Delta_\varphi^{-i\frac{s}{2\beta}}\, T(z)\, \Delta_\psi^{i\frac{s}{2\beta}}\,, \qquad z \in \mathbb{S}_\beta\,,\ s \in \mathbb{R}\,.$$

Now choose some $s_o \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \Xi_o$ and denote

$$T = \Delta_\psi^{i\frac{s_o}{2\beta}}\, T(s_o)\, \Delta_\varphi^{-i\frac{s_o}{2\beta}}\,.$$

Then T is Hermitian with respect to (ψ, φ) and we have for every $s \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \Xi_o$

$$\begin{aligned} T(s) &= wo - \lim_{0<t/\beta\to 0} T(s+it) \\ &= wo - \lim_{0<t/\beta\to 0} \Delta_\varphi^{-i\frac{s-s_o}{2\beta}}\, T(s_o+it)\, \Delta_\varphi^{i\frac{s-s_o}{2\beta}} \\ &= \Delta_\varphi^{-i\frac{s-s_o}{2\beta}} \Big(wo - \lim_{0<t/\beta\to 0} T(s_o+it) \Big)\, \Delta_\varphi^{i\frac{s-s_o}{2\beta}} \\ &= \Delta_\varphi^{-i\frac{s}{2\beta}} \Big(\Delta_\psi^{i\frac{s_o}{2\beta}}\, T(s_o)\, \Delta_\varphi^{-i\frac{s_o}{2\beta}} \Big) \Delta_\psi^{i\frac{s}{2\beta}} \\ &= \Delta_\varphi^{-i\frac{s}{2\beta}}\, T\, \Delta_\psi^{i\frac{s}{2\beta}}\,, \end{aligned}$$

that is (2.36) holds. Using (1) ⇒ (8) in Theorem 2.12, (2.32) and (2.33), as well as the uniqueness theorem of the Riesz brothers (see, in Section 3, Step 1 of the proof of (3) ⇒ (4) in Theorem 2.3), we obtain that $T(\,\cdot\,)$ extends to an *so*-continuous map on $\mathbb{S}_\beta$, for which (2.37) and (2.38) hold.

□

7. Proof of Theorem 2.1

We recall the setting:

- $N \subset M \subset B(H)$ are von Neumann algebras,
- φ is a normal semifinite faithful weight on M such that its restriction ψ to N is semifinite,
- we assume that M is in standard form with respect to φ and $\{y_\varphi\,;\, y \in \mathfrak{N}_\psi\}$ is dense in H , hence N is in standard form with respect to ψ and $y_\psi = y_\varphi$ for all $y \in \mathfrak{N}_\psi$.

We shall use the notations $\Delta_M = \Delta_\varphi$, $J_M = J_\varphi$ and $\Delta_N = \Delta_\psi$, $J_N = J_\psi$.

The proof of Theorem 2.1 will be performed in nine steps.

Step 1. Application of the Modular Extension Theorem.

Since $S_\psi \subset S_\varphi$, hence $H^{S_\psi} \subset H^{S_\varphi}$, the identity map I on H is Hermitian with respect to (ψ, φ) . By (1) ⇔ (8) in Theorem 2.12, (2.32) and (2.33), we obtain an *so*-continuous map

$$\overline{\mathbb{S}_{-1/2}} \ni z \longmapsto I(z) \in B(H)\,,$$

which is analytic in $\mathbb{S}_{-1/2}$ and satisfies the conditions

$$I(s) = \Delta_M^{is}\,\Delta_N^{-is} \text{ and } I\Big(s - \frac{i}{2}\Big) = J_M\, I(s)\, J_N\,, \qquad s \in \mathbb{R}\,,$$
$$\|I(z)\| \le 1\,, \qquad z \in \overline{\mathbb{S}_{-1/2}}\,.$$

Therefore the mapping

$$\overline{\mathbb{S}_{-1/2}} \ni \zeta \longmapsto W(\zeta) = I(-\overline{\zeta})^* \in B(H)$$

is *so*-continuous, analytic in $\mathbb{S}_{-1/2}$, and such that

$$W(s) = \Delta_N^{-is}\,\Delta_M^{is} \text{ and } W\Big(s - \frac{i}{2}\Big) = J_N\, W(s)\, J_M\,, \qquad s \in \mathbb{R}\,, \tag{7.1}$$

$$\|W(\zeta)\| \le 1\,, \qquad \zeta \in \overline{\mathbb{S}_{-1/2}}\,. \tag{7.2}$$

Step 2. HERMITICITY ON THE BOUNDARY.

First we show that

$$\Big(W\Big(s - \frac{i}{2}\Big) x_\psi \,\Big|\, J_N\, y_\psi\Big) \in \mathbb{R}\,, \qquad x^* = x \in \mathfrak{N}_\psi\,,\ y^* = y \in \mathfrak{N}_\psi\,,$$

what is equivalent, according to (1) ⇔ (3) in Theorem 2.12, to

$$W\Big(s - \frac{i}{2}\Big) \text{ is Hermitian with respect to } (\psi, \psi)\,, \qquad s \in \mathbb{R}\,. \tag{7.3}$$

Indeed,

$$\begin{aligned}\Big(W\Big(s - \frac{i}{2}\Big) x_\psi \,\Big|\, J_N\, y_\psi\Big) &\overset{(7.1)}{=} \big(J_N\, \Delta_N^{-is}\Delta_M^{is}\, J_M\, x_\psi \,\big|\, J_N\, y_\psi\big) = \big(\Delta_N^{is}\, y_\psi \,\big|\, \Delta_M^{is}\, J_M\, x_\psi\big)\\ &\overset{(2.2)}{=} \big(\Delta_N^{is}\, y_\psi \,\big|\, J_M\, \Delta_M^{is}\, x_\varphi\big) \overset{(2.3)}{=} \big(\sigma_s^\psi(y)_\psi \,\big|\, J_M\, \sigma_s^\varphi(x)_\varphi\big)\\ &= \big(\sigma_s^\psi(y)_\varphi \,\big|\, J_M\, \sigma_s^\varphi(x)_\varphi\big)\end{aligned}$$

is real because of Lemma 2.9.(2).

Next we show, using the negative half-sided modular inclusion assumption (2.19), that

$$W(s) \text{ is Hermitian with respect to } (\psi, \psi)\,, \qquad s \le 0\,, \tag{7.4}$$

$$J_N\, W(s)\, J_N \text{ is Hermitian with respect to } (\psi, \psi)\,, \qquad s \ge 0\,. \tag{7.5}$$

For (7.4), let $s \le 0$ and $x^* = x \in \mathfrak{N}_\psi$ be arbitrary. By (2.19) we have $\sigma_s^\varphi(x) \in N$, so $\sigma_s^\varphi(x) \in \mathfrak{N}_\psi$ and $\sigma_s^\varphi(x)_\varphi = \sigma_s^\varphi(x)_\psi$. Thus

$$W(s)\, x_\psi \overset{(7.1)}{=} \Delta_N^{-is}\Delta_M^{is}\, x_\varphi \overset{(2.3)}{=} \Delta_N^{-is}\sigma_s^\varphi(x)_\varphi = \Delta_N^{-is}\sigma_s^\varphi(x)_\psi \overset{(2.3)}{=} \sigma_{-s}^\psi\big(\sigma_s^\varphi(x)\big)_\psi$$

and the Hermiticity of $W(s)$ with respect to (ψ, ψ) follows by using (2) ⇒ (1) in Theorem 2.12.

Now, for (7.5), let $s \ge 0$ and $x^* = x \in \mathfrak{N}_\psi$ be arbitrary. Then, due to (2.19), we have

$$\sigma_{-s}^\varphi\big(\sigma_s^\psi(x)\big) \in \mathfrak{N}_\psi \text{ and } \sigma_{-s}^\varphi\big(\sigma_s^\psi(x)\big)_\psi \overset{(2.3)}{=} \Delta_M^{-is}\Delta_N^{is}\, x_\varphi \overset{(7.1)}{=} W(s)^* x_\psi\,,$$

so $W(s)^* x_\psi \in H^{S_\psi}$. Therefore, owing to (2) ⇒ (7) in Theorem 2.12, $J_N\, W(s)\, J_N$ is Hermitian with respect to (ψ, ψ) .

To summarize,

- $W(\zeta)$ is Hermitian with respect to (ψ, ψ) for $\zeta \in (-\infty, 0\,] \cup \Big(\mathbb{R} - \dfrac{i}{2}\Big)$ and
- $J_N\, W(\zeta)\, J_N$ is Hermitian with respect to (ψ, ψ) for $\zeta \in [0, \infty)$.

Step 3. CHANGE OF VARIABLE.

We shall use the analytic logarithm branches

$$\log_+ : \Big\{ r\, e^{i\theta}\, ;\, r > 0\, ,\, -\frac{\pi}{2} < \theta < \frac{3\pi}{2} \Big\} \ni r\, e^{i\theta} \longmapsto \log r + i\, \theta\, ,$$

$$\log_- : \Big\{ r\, e^{i\theta}\, ;\, r > 0\, ,\, -\frac{3\pi}{2} < \theta < \frac{\pi}{2} \Big\} \ni r\, e^{i\theta} \longmapsto \log r + i\, \theta\, .$$

For any $\beta \in \mathbb{R}$, $\beta \neq 0$, we consider (like in Section 3, in the proof of (3) $\Rightarrow$ (4) in Theorem 2.3) the one point compactification of the right half and the left half of $\overline{\mathbb{S}_\beta}$ and denote each added point by $+\infty$ and $-\infty$, respectively.

In order to apply Theorem 2.13 to W, we have to map $\mathbb{S}_{-1/2}$ conformally onto some $\mathbb{S}_\beta$, $\beta \neq 0$, such that $(-\infty, 0\,) \cup \{-\infty\} \cup \Big(\mathbb{R} - \dfrac{i}{2}\Big)$ correspond to $\mathbb{R}$, and $(0, \infty)$ to $\mathbb{R} + i\,\beta$. This is done, for $\beta = \pi$, by

$$\overline{\mathbb{S}_{-1/2}} \setminus \{0\} \ni \zeta \longmapsto \Psi(\zeta) = \log_+ \big(1 - e^{2\pi\zeta}\big) \in \overline{\mathbb{S}_\pi} \setminus \{0\}\, ,$$

which extends to a homeomorphism $\Psi : \overline{\mathbb{S}_{-1/2}} \cup \{-\infty, +\infty\} \longrightarrow \overline{\mathbb{S}_\pi} \cup \{-\infty, +\infty\}$ satisfying $\Psi(0) = -\infty$, $\Psi(-\infty) = 0$ and $\Psi(+\infty) = +\infty$.

The inverse homeomorphism $\Psi^{-1} : \overline{\mathbb{S}_\pi} \cup \{-\infty, +\infty\} \longrightarrow \overline{\mathbb{S}_{-1/2}} \cup \{-\infty, +\infty\}$ is given by

$$\overline{\mathbb{S}_\pi} \setminus \{0\} \ni z \longmapsto \Psi^{-1}(z) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \log_- \big(1 - e^z\big) \in \overline{\mathbb{S}_{-1/2}} \setminus \{0\}\, ,$$

$$\Psi^{-1}(0) = -\infty\, ,\ \Psi^{-1}(-\infty) = 0\, ,\ \Psi^{-1}(+\infty) = +\infty\, ,$$

so it maps $\mathbb{S}_\pi$ conformally onto $\mathbb{S}_{-1/2}$ and

$$(-\infty, 0)\ \text{onto}\ (-\infty, 0) \qquad \Big(0_- \mapsto -\infty\, ,\ \ -\infty \mapsto 0_-\Big)\, ,$$

$$(0, +\infty)\ \text{onto}\ \mathbb{R} - \frac{i}{2} \qquad \Big(0_+ \mapsto -\infty - \frac{i}{2}\, ,\ \ +\infty \mapsto +\infty + \frac{i}{2}\Big)\, ,$$

$$\mathbb{R} + i\pi\ \text{onto}\ (0, +\infty) \qquad \Big(-\infty + i\pi \mapsto 0_+\, ,\ \ i\pi \mapsto \frac{\log 2}{2\,\pi}\, ,\ \ +\infty + i\pi \mapsto +\infty\Big)\, .$$

Thus we can consider the *so*-continuous mapping

$$\overline{\mathbb{S}_\pi} \setminus \{0\} \ni z \longmapsto V(z) = W\big(\Psi^{-1}(z)\big) \in B(H)\, , \tag{7.6}$$

which is analytic in $\mathbb{S}_\pi$ and, according to (7.2), (7.3), (7.4) and (7.5), satisfies

$$\|V(z)\| \leq 1\, , \qquad z \in \overline{\mathbb{S}_\pi} \setminus \{0\}\, , \tag{7.7}$$

$$V(s)\ \text{is Hermitian with respect to}\ (\psi, \psi)\, , \qquad s \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}\, , \tag{7.8}$$

$$J_N\, V(s + i\pi)\, J_N\ \text{is Hermitian with respect to}\ (\psi, \psi)\, , \qquad s \in \mathbb{R}\, . \tag{7.9}$$

Step 4. APPLICATION OF THE GENERALIZED STRUCTURE THEOREM.

Since the *so*-continuous mapping considered in (7.6) is analytic in $\mathbb{S}_\pi$ and (7.7), (7.8), (7.9) hold, it satisfies the assumptions for $T(\,\cdot\,)$ in Theorem 2.13 with

M replaced by N , φ replaced by ψ , $\beta = \pi$, $\Xi_o = \{0\}$ and $\Xi_1 = \emptyset$.

By Theorem 2.13 it follows that, for some $V \in B(H)$ which is Hermitian with respect to (ψ, ψ) ,

$$V(s) = \Delta_N^{-i\frac{s}{2\pi}} \, V \, \Delta_N^{i\frac{s}{2\pi}} , \qquad s \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\} \tag{7.10}$$

and the mapping (7.6) has an *so*-continuous extension

$$\overline{\mathbb{S}_\pi} \ni z \longmapsto V(z) \in B(H)$$

with $V(0) = V$, satisfying

$$V(z + 2\pi t) = \Delta_N^{-it} \, V(z) \, \Delta_N^{it} , \qquad z \in \overline{\mathbb{S}_\pi} , \ t \in \mathbb{R} , \tag{7.11}$$

$$V(s + i\pi) = J_N \, V(s) \, J_N , \qquad s \in \mathbb{R} . \tag{7.12}$$

In particular,

$$V(0) = so - \lim_{0 \neq s \to 0} V(s) = so - \lim_{t \to -\infty} W(t) = so - \lim_{t \to -\infty} \Delta_N^{-it} \, \Delta_M^{it}$$

is a wave operator.

We notice an additional continuity property of $V(\,\cdot\,)$: since $\Psi^{-1}(-\infty) = 0$, the limit

$$so - \lim_{\overline{\mathbb{S}_\pi} \ni z \to -\infty} V(z) = so - \lim_{\overline{\mathbb{S}_{-1/2}} \ni \zeta \to 0} W(\zeta) = W(0) = 1_H$$

exists. Thus the mapping (7.6) has actually an *so*-continuous extension

$$\overline{\mathbb{S}_\pi} \cup \{-\infty\} \ni z \longmapsto V(z) \in B(H) \tag{7.13}$$

with $V(0) = so - \lim_{t \to -\infty} \Delta_N^{-it} \, \Delta_M^{it}$ and $V(-\infty) = 1_H$.

Step 5. FURTHER CHANGE OF VARIABLE.

We recall that

$$\overline{\mathbb{S}_\pi} \ni z \longmapsto \Theta(z) = e^z \in \{\zeta \in \mathbb{C} \, ; \, \Im\zeta \geq 0\} \setminus \{0\}$$

is a homeomorphism mapping $\mathbb{S}_\pi$ conformally onto $\{\zeta \in \mathbb{C} \, ; \, \Im\zeta > 0\}$, which extends to a homeomorphism $\Theta : \overline{\mathbb{S}_\pi} \cup \{-\infty, +\infty\} \longrightarrow \{\zeta \in \mathbb{C} \, ; \, \Im\zeta \geq 0\} \cup \{\infty\}$ satisfying $\Theta(-\infty) = 0$ and $\Theta(+\infty) = \infty$.

The inverse homeomorphism $\Theta^{-1} : \{\zeta \in \mathbb{C} \, ; \, \Im\zeta \geq 0\} \cup \{\infty\} \longrightarrow \overline{\mathbb{S}_\pi} \cup \{-\infty, +\infty\}$, which maps $\{\zeta \in \mathbb{C} \, ; \, \Im\zeta > 0\}$ conformally onto $\mathbb{S}_\pi$, is given by

$$\{\zeta \in \mathbb{C} \, ; \, \Im\zeta \geq 0\} \setminus \{0\} \ni \zeta \longmapsto \Theta^{-1}(\zeta) = \log_+ \zeta \in \overline{\mathbb{S}_\pi} ,$$

$$\Theta^{-1}(0) = -\infty , \quad \Theta^{-1}(\infty) = +\infty .$$

Since the mapping (7.13) is *so*-continuous, also the mapping

$$\{\zeta \in \mathbb{C} \, ; \, \Im\zeta \geq 0\} \ni \zeta \longmapsto U(\zeta) = V\big(\Theta^{-1}(\zeta)\big) \in B(H)$$

is *so*-continuous. Moreover, since $\mathbb{S}_\pi \ni z \longmapsto V(z)$ is analytic, the restriction of the above mapping to $\{\zeta \in \mathbb{C} \, ; \, \Im\zeta > 0\}$ is analytic.

For $\zeta = 0$ and $\zeta = 1$ we have

$$U(0) = V(-\infty) = 1_H , \qquad U(1) = V(0) = so - \lim_{t \to -\infty} \Delta_N^{-it} \, \Delta_M^{it} .$$

In particular, $U(0)$ and $U(1)$ are unitaries and $\Delta_N^{is}\, U(1) = U(1)\, \Delta_M^{is}$ for all $s \in \mathbb{R}$. On the other hand, for $\zeta \in \mathbb{C}$, $\Im\zeta \geq 0$, $\zeta \neq 0, 1$,

$$U(\zeta) = V\big(\Theta^{-1}(\zeta)\big) = V\big(\log_+ \zeta\big) = W\big(\Psi^{-1}(\log_+ \zeta)\big) = W\left(\frac{1}{2\pi}\log_-(1-\zeta)\right)$$

holds. In particular, according to (7.1), also the operators

$$\{U(s)\,;\, s \in \mathbb{R}\,,\, s \neq 0\,,1\} = \{V(z)\,;\, z \in \partial\mathbb{S}_\pi\,,\, z \neq 0\} = \{W(\zeta)\,;\, \zeta \in \partial\mathbb{S}_{-i/2}\,,\, \zeta \neq 0\}$$

are unitaries.

We summarize:

$$\begin{aligned}
&U(0) = 1_H \text{ and } U(s) \text{ is unitary for every } s \in \mathbb{R}\,, \\
&U(1) = so - \lim_{t\to-\infty} \Delta_N^{-it}\,\Delta_M^{it} \text{ and } \Delta_N^{is}\,U(1) = U(1)\,\Delta_M^{is}\,, \qquad s \in \mathbb{R}\,, && (7.14)\\
&U(\zeta) = V\big(\log_+ \zeta\big)\,, \qquad 0 \neq \zeta \in \mathbb{C}\,, \Im\zeta \geq 0\,, && (7.15)\\
&U(\zeta) = W\left(\frac{1}{2\pi}\log_-(1-\zeta)\right), \qquad 1 \neq \zeta \in \mathbb{C}\,, \Im\zeta \geq 0\,. && (7.16)
\end{aligned}$$

Using (7.15), we obtain from (7.7), (7.11) and (7.12)

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|U(\zeta)\| \leq 1\,, \qquad \zeta \in \mathbb{C}\,, \Im\zeta \geq 0\,, && (7.17)\\
&U\big(e^{2\pi t}\zeta\big) = \Delta_N^{-it}\,U(\zeta)\,\Delta_N^{it}\,, \qquad t \in \mathbb{R}\,,\, \zeta \in \mathbb{C}\,, \Im\zeta \geq 0\,, && (7.18)\\
&U(-s) = J_N\,U(s)\,J_N\,, \qquad s \in \mathbb{R}\,. && (7.19)
\end{aligned}$$

Indeed, (7.7) implies that $\|U(\zeta)\| \leq 1$ for $0 \neq \zeta \in \mathbb{C}$, $\Im\zeta \geq 0$, while the norm of $U(0) = 1_H$ is ≤ 1. Similarly, the equality in (7.18) is an immediate consequence of (7.11) for $0 \neq \zeta \in \mathbb{C}$, $\Im\zeta \geq 0$, while it is trivial for $\zeta = 0$. Finally, for any $s > 0$, (7.12) implies

$$U(-s) = V(\log s + i\,\pi) = J_N\,V(\log s)\,J_N = J_N\,U(s)\,J_N\,,$$

hence also $J_N\,U(-s)\,J_N = J_N^2\,U(s)\,J_N^2 = U(s)$. Therefore the equality in (7.19) holds for every $s \in \mathbb{R}$ (it is trivial for $s = 0$).

Furthermore, by (7.16) and (7.1),

$$U(2) = W\left(\frac{1}{2\pi}\log_-(-1)\right) = W\left(-\frac{i}{2}\right) = J_N\,W(0)\,J_M = J_N\,J_M\,. \tag{7.20}$$

On the other hand, (7.16) is equivalent to the equality

$$W(z) = U\big(1 - e^{2\pi z}\big)\,, \qquad z \in \overline{\mathbb{S}_{-i/2}}\,,$$

which yields

$$\Delta_N^{-it}\,\Delta_M^{it} = W(t) = U\big(1 - e^{2\pi t}\big)\,, \qquad t \in \mathbb{R}\,. \tag{7.21}$$

Step 6. GROUP PROPERTY OF $U(\,\cdot\,)$.

We now prove the group property

$$U(s_1)\,U(s_2) = U(s_1 + s_2)\,, \qquad s_1\,,\, s_2 \in \mathbb{R}\,. \tag{7.22}$$

Let $s > 0$ and $t \in \mathbb{R}$ be arbitrary. By (7.15), (7.10). (7.14) and (7.21), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} U(s) = V(\log s) = \Delta_N^{-i\frac{\log s}{2\pi}} V(0)\, \Delta_N^{i\frac{\log s}{2\pi}} = \Delta_N^{-i\frac{\log s}{2\pi}} U(1)\, \Delta_N^{i\frac{\log s}{2\pi}} = \\ = U(1)\, \Delta_M^{-i\frac{\log s}{2\pi}} \Delta_N^{i\frac{\log s}{2\pi}} = U(1)\, W\left(\frac{\log s}{2\pi}\right)^* = U(1)\, U(1-s)^*\,, \end{aligned}$$

hence $U(s)\, U(1-s) = U(1)$. By sandwiching this equation by Ad Δ_N^{-it} and taking into account (7.18), we get

$$U\big(e^{2\pi t}s\big)\, U\big(e^{2\pi t}(1-s)\big) = U\big(e^{2\pi t}\big)\,. \tag{7.23}$$

Next let $r_1\,,\ r_2 \in \mathbb{R}$ be such that $r_1 > 0$ and $r_1 + r_2 > 0$. Then $s = \dfrac{r_1}{r_1 + r_2} > 0$ and, with $t = \dfrac{1}{2\pi} \log(r_1 + r_2) \in \mathbb{R}$, we have $e^{2\pi t}s = r_1$, $e^{2\pi t}(1-s) = r_2$. Thus (7.23) yields

$$U(r_1)\, U(r_2) = U(r_1 + r_2)\,. \tag{7.24}$$

Finally let $s_1\,,\ s_2 \in \mathbb{R}$ be arbitrary and choose $s \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $s > 0$, $s + s_1 > 0$ and $s + s_1 + s_2 > 0$. Then, using (7.24) with (r_1, r_2) equal to $(s\,, s_1)$, $(s + s_1, s_2)$ and $(s\,, s_1 + s_2)$, respectively, we obtain

$$U(s)\, U(s_1)\, U(s_2) = U(s + s_1)\, U(s_2) = U(s + s_1 + s_2) = U(s)\, U(s_1 + s_2)\,.$$

Since $U(s)$ is unitary, the above equality implies that $U(s_1)\, U(s_2) = U(s_1 + s_2)$.

Therefore (7.22) is proved. In particular,

$$U(s)\, U(-s) = U(0) = 1_H\,, \text{ that is } U(s)^* = U(-s)\,, \qquad s \in \mathbb{R}\,. \tag{7.25}$$

Thus $\mathbb{R} \ni s \longmapsto U(s) \in B(H)$ is an *so*-continuous one-parameter group of unitaries, which allows an *so*-continuous extension $\{\zeta \in \mathbb{C}\,;\, \Im\zeta \geq 0\} \ni \zeta \longmapsto U(\zeta)$, analytic in $\{\zeta \in \mathbb{C}\,;\, \Im\zeta > 0\}$ and satisfying (7.17). Consequently

$$U(s) = \exp(isP)\,, \qquad s \in \mathbb{R} \tag{7.26}$$

for some positive selfadjoint operator P in H.

Step 7. Further properties of $U(\,\cdot\,)$.

Here we show that the above constructed group $\mathbb{R} \ni s \longmapsto U(s) \in B(H)$ satisfies properties (1) - (7) in Theorem 2.1.

By (7.18), (7.21), (7.22) and (7.25), we obtain for all $s\,,\ t \in \mathbb{R}$

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_M^{-it}\, U(s)\, \Delta_M^{it} &= \big(\Delta_M^{-it}\Delta_N^{it}\big)\, \Delta_N^{-it}\, U(s)\, \Delta_N^{it}\big(\Delta_N^{-it}\Delta_M^{it}\big) = \\ &= U\big(1 - e^{2\pi t}\big)^*\, U\big(e^{2\pi t}s\big)\, U\big(1 - e^{2\pi t}\big) = U\big(e^{2\pi t}s\big)\,. \end{aligned} \tag{7.27}$$

This equality and (7.18) show that property (1) in Theorem 2.1 is satisfied.

Similarly, (7.19), (7.20), (7.22) and (7.25) yield for every $s \in \mathbb{R}$

$$\begin{aligned} J_M\, U(s)\, J_M &= \big(J_M\, J_N\big) J_N\, U(s)\, J_N \big(J_N\, J_M\big) \\ &= U(2)^*\, U(-s)\, U(2) = U(-s)\,. \end{aligned} \tag{7.28}$$

Now property (2) in Theorem 2.1 is (7.19) together with (7.28).

The validity of property (3) in Theorem 2.1 follows from (7.21) and (7.14).

The first equality in property (4) in Theorem 2.1 is (7.20), while the second one follows from (7.25), (7.28), (7.22) and (7.20) :

$$U(1)\, J_M\, U(1)^* = U(1)\, J_M\, U(-1) = U(1)^2\, J_M = U(2)\, J_M = J_N\,. \tag{7.29}$$

Next we prove property (5). Since

$$\Delta_M^{-it}\,\Delta_N^{it}\,N\,\Delta_N^{-it}\,\Delta_M^{it}=\Delta_M^{-it}\,N\,\Delta_M^{it}\subset\Delta_M^{-it}\,M\,\Delta_M^{it}=M\,,\qquad t\in\mathbb{R}\,,$$

(7.14) implies

$$U(1)^*N\,U(1)\subset M\,. \tag{7.30}$$

On the other hand, by sandwiching this relation by $\operatorname{Ad}J_M$ and using (7.29), we obtain

$$M'=J_M\,M\,J_M\supset J_M\,U(1)^*N\,U(1)\,J_M=U(1)^*J_N\,N\,J_N\,U(1)=U(1)^*N'\,U(1)\,.$$

Passing to the commutants, this inclusion relation yields

$$M\subset U(1)^*N\,U(1)\,,$$

which together with (7.30) gives $U(1)^*N\,U(1)=M$, that is

$$N=U(1)\,M\,U(1)^*\,. \tag{7.31}$$

For property (6) in Theorem 2.1 we notice that (7.1) and the negative half-sided modular inclusion assumption (2.19) imply that $W(t)\,N\,W(t)^*\subset N$ for all $t\leq 0$, what is by (7.21) equivalent to

$$U(s)\,N\,U(s)^*\subset N\,,\qquad 0\leq s\leq 1\,.$$

Using (7.31), (7.22) and (7.25), we get for every $0\leq s\leq 1$

$$\begin{aligned}U(s)\,M\,U(s)^*&=U(s)\,U(1)^*N\,U(1)\,U(s)^*=U(1)^*U(s)\,N\,U(s)^*U(1)\\&\subset U(1)^*N\,U(1)=M\,.\end{aligned}$$

Using now induction on n , it follows that

$$U(s)\,M\,U(s)^*\subset M\,,\qquad 0\leq s\leq n$$

holds for every integer $n\geq 1$, that is $U(s)\,M\,U(s)^*\subset M$ for all $s\geq 0$.

(7) is an immediate consequence of (6), (5) and (4).

Step 8. Invariance properties of $U(\,\cdot\,)$ with respect to φ .

We show in the following that $\mathbb{R}\ni s\longmapsto U(s)\in B(H)$ satisfies property (8) in Theorem 2.1, hence also property (9), which is an immediate consequence of (8).

For any $y\in\mathfrak{N}_\psi$ and $t\in\mathbb{R}$, (2.3) yields

$$\Delta_N^{it}\,y\,\Delta_N^{-it}\in\mathfrak{N}_\psi\subset\mathfrak{N}_\varphi\ \text{ and }\ \big(\Delta_N^{it}\,y\,\Delta_N^{-it}\big)_\varphi=\big(\Delta_N^{it}\,y\,\Delta_N^{-it}\big)_\psi=\Delta_N^{it}\,y_\psi\,.$$

Setting $s=1-e^{2\pi t}$ and using (7.21), we obtain

$$U(s)^*y\,U(s)=\Delta_M^{-it}\,\Delta_N^{it}\,y\,\Delta_N^{-it}\,\Delta_M^{it}\in\Delta_M^{-it}\,\mathfrak{N}_\psi\,\Delta_M^{it}\subset\Delta_M^{-it}\,\mathfrak{N}_\varphi\,\Delta_M^{it}\subset\mathfrak{N}_\varphi\,,$$

$$\begin{aligned}\big(U(s)^*y\,U(s)\big)_\varphi&=\Delta_M^{-it}\big(\Delta_N^{it}\,y\,\Delta_N^{-it}\big)_\varphi=\Delta_M^{-it}\big(\Delta_N^{it}\,y\,\Delta_N^{-it}\big)_\psi=\Delta_M^{-it}\Delta_N^{it}\,y_\psi\\&=U(s)^*y_\psi\,.\end{aligned}$$

Therefore we have for all $s\in\mathbb{R}$, $s<1$,

$$U(s)^*y\,U(s)\in\mathfrak{N}_\varphi\ \text{ and }\ \big(U(s)^*y\,U(s)\big)_\varphi=U(s)^*y_\psi\,. \tag{7.32}$$

Moreover, according to the Lebesgue continuity result Proposition 2.7, (7.32) holds also for $s=1$.

According to (7.31), $\gamma_1 : M\ni x\longmapsto U(1)\,x\,U(1)^*\in N$ is a $*$-isomorphism with inverse $\gamma_1^{-1} : N\ni y\longmapsto U(1)^*y\,U(1)\in M$. The modular automorphism groups of the normal semifinite faithful weights ψ and $\varphi\circ{\gamma_1}^{-1}$ are equal. Indeed, by (7.14) we have for every $y\in N$ and $t\in\mathbb{R}$:

$$\begin{aligned}\sigma_t^{\varphi\circ{\gamma_1}^{-1}}(y)=\gamma_1\Big(\sigma_t^{\varphi}\big({\gamma_1}^{-1}(y)\big)\Big)&=U(1)\,\Delta_M^{it}\,U(1)^*y\,U(1)\,\Delta_M^{-it}\,U(1)^*\\&=\Delta_N^{it}\,y\,\Delta_N^{-it}=\sigma_t^{\psi}(y)\,.\end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, for every $y\in\mathfrak{N}_\psi$, using (7.32) with $s=1$, we obtain

$$\psi(y^*y)=\|y_\psi\|^2=\|\,U(1)^*y_\psi\|^2=\|{\gamma_1}^{-1}(y)_\varphi\|^2=\varphi\circ{\gamma_1}^{-1}(y^*y)\,,$$

so $\varphi\circ{\gamma_1}^{-1}$ and ψ coincide on $\mathfrak{M}_\psi$. Thus [28], Proposition 5.9 yields $\psi=\varphi\circ{\gamma_1}^{-1}$, that is

$$\varphi\circ\gamma_1=\psi\circ\gamma_1=\varphi\,. \tag{7.33}$$

In particular, for every $x\in M$ and $n\geq 0$,

$$x\in\mathfrak{N}_\varphi\iff\gamma_n(x)\in\mathfrak{N}_\varphi\,. \tag{7.34}$$

Let $x\in\mathfrak{N}_\varphi$ be arbitrary. By (7.34) and (7.31) we have $\gamma_1(x)\in\mathfrak{N}_\psi$, so (7.32) holds with $y=\gamma_1(x)$ and any $0\leq s\leq 1$. Using the group property of $U(\,\cdot\,)$, we deduce that, for every $0\leq s\leq 1$,

$$\begin{aligned}&\gamma_s(x)=U(s)\,x\,U(s)^*=U(1-s)^*\gamma_1(x)\,U(1-s)\in\mathfrak{N}_\varphi\ \text{ and}\\&\gamma_s(x)_\varphi=U(1-s)^*\gamma_1(x)_\psi\,.\end{aligned} \tag{7.35}$$

In particular, for $s=0$ we get $x_\varphi=U(1)^*\gamma_1(x)_\psi$, that is $\gamma_1(x)_\psi=U(1)\,x_\varphi$. Thus (7.35) yields

$$\gamma_s(x)\in\mathfrak{N}_\varphi\ \text{ and }\ \gamma_s(x)_\varphi=U(s)\,x_\varphi\,,\qquad 0\leq s\leq 1\,. \tag{7.36}$$

Iterating (7.36), we obtain

$$x\in\mathfrak{N}_\varphi\,,\ s\geq 0\implies\gamma_s(x)\in\mathfrak{N}_\varphi\ \text{ and }\ \gamma_s(x)_\varphi=U(s)\,x_\varphi\,. \tag{7.37}$$

On the other hand, for $x\in M$ and $s\geq 0$, denoting by n the integer part of s, that is the integer $n\geq 0$ with $n\leq s<n+1$, we have

$$\gamma_s(x)\in\mathfrak{N}_\varphi\overset{(7.37)}{\implies}\gamma_{n+1}(x)=\gamma_{n+1-s}\big(\gamma_s(x)\big)\in\mathfrak{N}_\varphi\overset{(7.34)}{\implies}x\in\mathfrak{N}_\varphi\,.$$

Consequently property (8) in Theorem 2.1 is satisfied.

Step 9. DESCRIPTION OF THE GENERATOR P.

First we verify that statement (10) in Theorem 2.1 holds with P defined by (7.26).

We recall from Subsection (b) of Section 2 that, if we endow $\mathbb{R}^2$ with the Lie group structure defined by the composition law

$$(s_1,t_1)\cdot(s_2,t_2)=(s_1+e^{-2\pi t_1}s_2\,,\,t_1+t_2)\,,$$

then $\mathbb{R}^2\ni(s,t)\longmapsto T_s\,L_t\in\mathcal{P}_+^{\uparrow}(1)$ is a Lie group isomorphism. Hence, by (7.27),

$$\pi:\mathcal{P}_+^{\uparrow}(1)\ni T_s\,L_t\longmapsto U(s)\,\Delta_M^{it}$$

is an *so*-continuous unitary representation on H and, according to (7.21), the group $\pi\big(\mathcal{P}_+^{\uparrow}(1)\big)$ contains $\{\Delta_M^{it}\,,\,\Delta_N^{is}\,;\,t\,,\,s\in\mathbb{R}\}$ and is generated by this set.

Let us consider the elements X_1, X_2, X_3 of the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{p}_+^{\uparrow}(1) \equiv \mathfrak{g}$ defined in (2.13). By (2.15) and by the definition of π, taking into account how $\mathcal{P}_+^{\uparrow}(1)$ was identified in Subsection (b) of Section 2 with $\mathcal{G}$, we obtain for every $t \in \mathbb{R}$:

$$\pi\big(\exp(t\,X_1)\big) = \pi(L_t) = \Delta_M^{it} = \exp\big(it\log\Delta_M\big)\,,$$

$$\pi\big(\exp(t\,X_2)\big) = \pi\big(T_{1-e^{-2\pi t}}\,L_t\big) = U\big(1-e^{-2\pi t}\big)\,\Delta_M^{it} \overset{(7.21)}{=} \Delta_N^{it} = \exp\big(it\log\Delta_N\big)\,,$$

$$\pi\big(\exp(t\,X_3)\big) = \pi(T_t) = U(t) \overset{(7.26)}{=} \exp(itP)\,.$$

Therefore, according to (2.16),

$$\overline{\mathrm{d}\pi(X_1)} = i\,\log\Delta_M\,,\quad \overline{\mathrm{d}\pi(X_2)} = i\,\log\Delta_N\,,\quad \overline{\mathrm{d}\pi(X_3)} = i\,P\,. \tag{7.38}$$

Since any two of X_1, X_2, X_3 is a basis for $\mathfrak{g}_+^{\uparrow}(1)$ and $\mathcal{P}_+^{\uparrow}(1)$ is connected and simply connected, the representation π is uniquely determined by any two of the relations (7.38) (see e.g. [2], Ch. 11, § 5 or [30], Proposition 10.5.2).

Now, by (2.14), (2.18) and (7.38), we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} iP = \overline{\mathrm{d}\pi(X_3)} &= \frac{1}{2\pi}\,\overline{\mathrm{d}\pi(X_2 - X_1)} = \frac{1}{2\pi}\,\Big(\overline{\overline{\mathrm{d}\pi(X_2)} - \overline{\mathrm{d}\pi(X_1)}}\Big) \\ &= \frac{i}{2\pi}\,\Big(\overline{\log\Delta_N - \log\Delta_M}\Big)\,, \end{aligned}$$

hence P is the closure of $\dfrac{1}{2\pi}\Big(\log\Delta_N - \log\Delta_M\Big)$.

□

8. COMPLEMENTS TO THE IMPLEMENTATION THEOREM OF BORCHERS AND THE PROOF OF THEOREM 2.2

First we prove Theorem 2.14, which will then be used to prove Theorem 2.2.

Proof of **Theorem 2.14**.

Step 1. THE EXISTENCE AND THE UNIQUENESS OF b (it is essentially the proof of [1], Theorem 3.1 and [44], Corollary 5.7).

By the lower boundedness of P we have $d_o = \exp(-P) \in B(H)$. Moreover, d_o is clearly positive and injective. Denoting $\beta_s = \alpha_{-s}$, $(\beta_s)_{s\in\mathbb{R}}$ is an *so*-continuous group of $*$-automorphisms of M such that

$$\beta_s(x) = {d_o}^{is} x\, {d_o}^{-is}\,, \qquad s\in\mathbb{R}\,,\, x\in M\,.$$

We recall that, according to [44], Theorem 1.4, we have for every $\lambda\in\mathbb{R}$:

$$\begin{aligned} &M^{\alpha}\big([-\lambda,+\infty)\big) = M^{\beta}\big((-\infty,\lambda]\big) = \\ &= \Big\{x\in\bigcap_{\substack{z\in\mathbb{C}\\ \Im z\geq 0}}\mathrm{Dom}\,(\alpha_z)\ ;\ \|\alpha_z(x)\| \leq e^{\lambda\Im z}\|x\| \text{ for all } z\in\mathbb{C}\,, \Im z\geq 0\Big\} = \\ &= \Big\{x\in\bigcap_{\substack{z\in\mathbb{C}\\ \Im z\leq 0}}\mathrm{Dom}\,(\beta_z)\ ;\ \|\beta_z(x)\| \leq e^{-\lambda\Im z}\|x\| \text{ for all } z\in\mathbb{C}\,, \Im z\leq 0\Big\}\,. \end{aligned} \tag{8.1}$$

Denoting

$$\begin{aligned} H_\lambda &= \text{the closed linear span of } M^\alpha\big([-\lambda,+\infty)\big)\,H = \\ &= \text{the closed linear span of } M^\beta\big((-\infty,\lambda]\big)\,H\,, \end{aligned}$$

we have clearly $H_\lambda\supset M^\beta\big((-\infty,0]\big)\,H\supset 1_H H=H$, hence $H_\lambda = H$, for all $\lambda\geq 0$. In particular, H is an *invariant subspace of support* 1_H *relative to* β , as defined in Section 5 of [44]. Moreover, since the spectral subspace of d_o corresponding to $(0,\|d_o\|]$ is H , the second statement in [44], Theorem 5.3 implies that H is *simply invariant*, that is $\bigcap\limits_{\lambda\in\mathbb{R}} H_\lambda=\{0\}$. Furthermore, $M'H_\lambda\subset H_\lambda$ implies that the orthogonal projection p_λ onto H_λ belongs to M .

Using now the first statement in [44], Theorem 5.3, it follows that there exists an injective $b\in B(H)$, $0\leq b\leq 1_H$, such that

$$\beta_s(x)=b^{is}x\,b^{-is}\,,\qquad s\in\mathbb{R}\,,\,x\in M \tag{8.2}$$

and, for every $\lambda\in\mathbb{R}$, the spectral projection $\chi_{(0,e^\lambda]}(b)$ is the orthogonal projection onto $H_{\lambda+0}=\bigcap\limits_{\mu>\lambda}H_\mu$, hence it is equal to $p_{\lambda+0}=so\!-\!\lim\limits_{\lambda<\mu\to\lambda}p_\mu\in M$. In particular, $b\in M$.

Property (i) in the statement of Theorem 2.14 holds by (8.2). In order to verify property (ii), let d be an arbitrary injective operator in M such that $0\leq d\leq 1_H$ and $\alpha_s(x)=d^{-is}x\,d^{is}$, $s\in\mathbb{R}$, $x\in M$, that is $\beta_s(x)=d^{is}x\,d^{-is}$, $s\in\mathbb{R}$, $x\in M$. Since the spectral subspace of the unitary group $(d^{is})_{s\in\mathbb{R}}$ corresponding to $(-\infty,\lambda]$ is $\chi_{(0,e^\lambda]}(d)\,H$, [44], Corollary 2.6 yields

$$M^\beta\big((-\infty,\lambda]\big)\,H=M^\beta\big((-\infty,\lambda]\big)\,\underbrace{\chi_{(0,e^0]}(d)}_{=1_H}\,H\subset\chi_{(0,e^\lambda]}(d)\,H\,,\qquad\lambda\in\mathbb{R}\,.$$

Consequently, $\chi_{(0,e^\lambda]}(b)=p_{\lambda+0}\leq\chi_{(0,e^\lambda]}(d)$ for all $\lambda\in\mathbb{R}$.

The uniqueness of b is an immediate consequence of (ii).

Step 2. PROOF OF (iii) AND (iv).

(iii) is clear from the construction of b in Step 1.

In order to verify (iv), let σ be a $*$-automorphism of M such that, for some $\lambda_\sigma>0$,

$$\sigma\circ\alpha_s=\alpha_{\lambda_\sigma s}\circ\sigma\,,\qquad s\in\mathbb{R}\,.$$

Then holds clearly

$$\sigma\circ\alpha_z=\alpha_{\lambda_\sigma z}\circ\sigma\,,\qquad z\in\mathbb{C}\,. \tag{8.3}$$

There exists a faithful unital normal $*$-representation $\pi:M\longrightarrow B(K)$, which is covariant with respect to σ , that is $\pi\big(\sigma(x)\big)=U\pi(x)\,U^*$, $x\in M$, where U is an appropriate unitary on K : for example, we can choose

$K=l^2(\mathbb{Z};H)$, the space of all square-summable two-sided sequences in H ,

$\pi(x)\,(\xi_k)_{k\in\mathbb{Z}}=\big(\sigma^k(x)\,\xi_k\big)_{k\in\mathbb{Z}}$ for $x\in M$, $(\xi_k)_{k\in\mathbb{Z}}\in l^2(\mathbb{Z};H)$,

$U\,(\xi_k)_{k\in\mathbb{Z}}=(\xi_{k+1})_{k\in\mathbb{Z}}$ for $(\xi_k)_{k\in\mathbb{Z}}\in l^2(\mathbb{Z};H)$.

Then $\big(\pi\circ\alpha_s\circ\pi^{-1}\big)_{s\in\mathbb{R}}$ is an so-continuous one-parameter group of $*$-automorphisms of the von Neumann algebra $\pi(M)\subset B(K)$, $\pi(b)$ is an injective element of $\pi(M)$

with $0 \leq \pi(b) \leq 1_K$ and

$$\big(\pi \circ \alpha_s \circ \pi^{-1}\big)\big(\pi(x)\big) = \pi(b)^{-is}\pi(x)\,\pi(b)^{is}\,, \qquad s \in \mathbb{R}\,,\, x \in M\,.$$

Moreover, by the definition of b, for any injective $\pi(d) \in \pi(M)$, $0 \leq \pi(d) \leq 1_K$, such that

$$\big(\pi \circ \alpha_s \circ \pi^{-1}\big)\big(\pi(x)\big) = \pi(d)^{-is}\pi(x)\,\pi(d)^{is}\,, \qquad s \in \mathbb{R}\,,\, x \in M\,,$$

we have

$$\chi_{(0,e^{\lambda}]}\big(\pi(b)\big) \leq \chi_{(0,e^{\lambda}]}\big(\pi(d)\big)\,, \qquad \lambda \in \mathbb{R}\,.$$

Applying the above proved (iii) to $\pi(M)$, $\big(\pi \circ \alpha_s \circ \pi^{-1}\big)_{s\in\mathbb{R}}$, $\pi(b)$ instead of M, α, b, we obtain that, for every $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$, $\pi\big(\chi_{(0,e^{\lambda}]}(b)\big) = \chi_{(0,e^{\lambda}]}\big(\pi(b)\big)$ is the orthogonal projection onto

$$\bigcap_{\mu>\lambda} \text{the closed linear span of } \pi(M)^{\pi\circ\alpha\circ\pi^{-1}}\big([-\mu,+\infty)\big)\,K =$$

$$= \bigcap_{\mu>\lambda} \text{the closed linear span of } \pi\Big(M^{\alpha}\big([-\mu,+\infty)\big)\Big)\,K$$

For every $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ and $x \in M$, by (8.1) and by (8.3), the following four conditions are equivalent:

$$x \in M^{\alpha}\big([-\lambda,+\infty)\big)\,,$$

$$x \in \bigcap_{\substack{z\in\mathbb{C}\\ \Im z\geq 0}} \operatorname{Dom}(\alpha_z) \ \text{ and } \ \big\|\sigma\big(\alpha_z(x)\big)\big\| = \|\alpha_z(x)\| \leq e^{\lambda\Im z}\|x\| \ \text{ for all } \ z \in \mathbb{C}\,,\, \Im z \geq 0\,,$$

$$\sigma(x) \in \bigcap_{\substack{z\in\mathbb{C}\\ \Im z\geq 0}} \operatorname{Dom}(\alpha_z) \ \text{ and } \ \big\|\alpha_{\lambda_\sigma z}\big(\sigma(x)\big)\big\| \leq e^{\lambda\Im z}\|x\| \ \text{ for all } \ z \in \mathbb{C}\,,\, \Im z \geq 0\,,$$

$$\sigma(x) \in M^{\alpha}\big([-\lambda_\sigma^{-1}\lambda,+\infty)\big)\,.$$

Therefore

$$\sigma\big(M^{\alpha}\big([-\lambda,+\infty)\big)\big) = M^{\alpha}\big([-\lambda_\sigma^{-1}\lambda,+\infty)\big)\,, \qquad \lambda \in \mathbb{R}\,. \tag{8.4}$$

Let next $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ be arbitrary. By the covariance property of π and by (8.4), we have for every $\mu > \lambda$:

$$\begin{aligned} U\,\pi\big(M^{\alpha}\big([-\mu,+\infty)\big)\big)\,K = {} & U\,\pi\big(M^{\alpha}\big([-\mu,+\infty)\big)\big)\,U^*K = \\ & = \pi\Big(\sigma\big(M^{\alpha}\big([-\mu,+\infty)\big)\big)\Big)K = \\ & = \pi\Big(M^{\alpha}\big([-\lambda_\sigma^{-1}\mu,+\infty)\big)\Big)K\,. \end{aligned}$$

Consequently $U\,\pi\big(\chi_{(0,e^{\lambda}]}(b)\big)K = \pi\big(\chi_{(0,e^{\lambda_\sigma^{-1}\lambda}]}\big(\pi(b)\big)\big)K$, and so

$$\pi\big(\sigma\big(\chi_{(0,e^{\lambda}]}(b)\big)\big) = U\,\pi\big(\chi_{(0,e^{\lambda}]}(b)\big)\,U^* = \pi\big(\chi_{(0,e^{\lambda_\sigma^{-1}\lambda}]}(b)\big)\,,$$

$$\chi_{(0,e^{\lambda}]}\big(\sigma(b)\big) = \sigma\big(\chi_{(0,e^{\lambda}]}(b)\big) = \chi_{(0,e^{\lambda_\sigma^{-1}\lambda}]}(b) = \chi_{(0,e^{\lambda}]}(b^{\lambda_\sigma})\,. \tag{8.5}$$

Now, by (8.5) we conclude that $\sigma(b) = b^{\lambda_\sigma}$.

□

Proof of **Theorem 2.2**.

Proof of (1). Let us consider $\gamma_s = \operatorname{Ad} U(s)$ for all $s \in \mathbb{R}$ (not only for $s \geq 0$) and let z be an arbitrary selfadjoint element of the center $Z(M)$ of M. By (6) in Theorem 2.1 we have $\gamma_s(z) \in M$ for all $s \geq 0$, hence z and $\gamma_s(z)$ commute for any $s \geq 0$. But then the elements of the set $\{\gamma_s(z)\,;\, s \in \mathbb{R}\}$ are mutually commuting, so the von Neumann algebra C generated by this set is commutative. Since

$\gamma_s = \operatorname{Ad} U(s)\,|\,M$ leaves C invariant for every $s \in \mathbb{R}$ and

$U(s) = \exp(isP)$, $s \in \mathbb{R}$, for some positive selfadjoint operator P in H,

according to the implementation theorem of Borchers [5] (see also Theorem 2.14) there exists an element $b \in C$, $0 \leq b \leq 1_H$, such that

$$\gamma_s(x) = b^{-is} x\, b^{is} = x\,, \qquad x \in C\,,\ s \in \mathbb{R}\,.$$

Consequently, $\gamma_s(z) = z$ for all $s \in \mathbb{R}$.

Proof of (2). By (5) in Theorem 2.1 and by the above proved (1), $Z(N) = Z\big(\gamma_1(M)\big) = Z(M)$. Now it is easy to see that the projection family

$$\{\, q \in Z(M)\,;\, Mq = Nq \,\}$$

is upward directed and its lowest upper bound is the greatest projection $p \in Z(M)$ satisfying $Mp = Np$.

The implication $e \leq p \implies U(s)\, e = e$ holds for any projection $e \in M$, because

$$Mp = Np \implies \varphi_p = \psi_p \overset{(2.10)}{\implies} \Delta_M^{it}\, p = \Delta_N^{it}\, p\,,\ t \in \mathbb{R} \implies U(s)\, p = p\,,\ s \in \mathbb{R}\,.$$

Now let $e \in M$ be an arbitrary projection such that

$$U(s)\, e = e\,, \qquad s \in \mathbb{R}\,. \tag{8.6}$$

For every $a \in \mathfrak{A}_\varphi$ and $x\,, y \in \mathfrak{N}_\varphi$, using (8) in Theorem 2.1, we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned}
(U(s)\, a\, e\, J_M\, x_\varphi \mid J_M\, y_\varphi) &\overset{(8.6)}{=} \big(\gamma_s(a)\, e\, J_M\, x_\varphi \,\big|\, J_M\, y_\varphi\big) = \big(e\, J_M\, x_\varphi \,\big|\, \gamma_s(a^*)\, J_M\, y_\varphi\big) \\
&\overset{(2.5)}{=} \big(e\, J_M\, x_\varphi \,\big|\, J_M\, y\, J_M\, \gamma_s(a^*)_\varphi\big) \\
&= \big(J_M\, y^*\, J_M\, e\, J_M\, x_\varphi \,\big|\, U(s)\, (a^*)_\varphi\big) \\
&= \big(e\, J_M\, y^* x_\varphi \,\big|\, U(s)\, (a^*)_\varphi\big) \\
&\overset{(8.6)}{=} \big(e\, J_M\, y^* x_\varphi \,\big|\, (a^*)_\varphi\big)
\end{aligned}$$

does not depend on $s \geq 0$, so $\big(\big(1_H - U(s)\big)\, a\, e\, J_M\, x_\varphi \,\big|\, J_M\, y_\varphi\big) = 0$ for all $s \geq 0$. By $\overline{\{J_M\, x_\varphi\,;\, x \in \mathfrak{N}_\varphi\}} = H$ and $\overline{\mathfrak{A}_\varphi}^{\,so} = M$, we get

$$\big(1_H - U(s)\big)\, M\, e\, H = \{0\}\,, \qquad s \in \mathbb{R}\,.$$

Since the orthogonal projection onto the closed linear span of $M\, e\, H$ is the central support $z(e) \in Z(M)$ of e, we obtain that $\big(1_H - U(s)\big)\, z(e) = 0$ for all $s \geq 0$, hence

$$U(s)\, z(e) = z(e)\,, \qquad s \in \mathbb{R}\,.$$

Consequently, $N z(e) = U(1)\, M\, U(1)^*\, z(e) = M z(e)$ and so $e \leq z(e) \leq p$.

Finally, let $e \in M^\varphi$ be a projection such that

$$U(s)\, e = e\, U(s)\,, \qquad s \in \mathbb{R}\,, \tag{8.7}$$

$$U(s)\, e J_M e J_M = e J_M e J_M\,, \qquad s \in \mathbb{R}\,. \tag{8.8}$$

If $\pi = \pi_{eJ_\varphi eJ_\varphi} : eMe \longrightarrow B(eJ_\varphi eJ_\varphi H)$ is the $*$-representation defined in (2.8), then, for every $s \geq 0$, (8.7) and (8.8) yield that $\gamma_s(eMe) \subset eMe$ and

$$\pi\big(\gamma_s(a)\big) = U(s)\, a\, U(-s) \,|\, eJ_M eJ_M H = a \,|\, eJ_M eJ_M H = \pi(a)\,, \qquad a \in eMe\,.$$

Since π is faithful, we obtain that $U(s)\, a\, U(-s) = \gamma_s(a) = a$ for all $s \geq 0$ and all $a \in eMe$. In other words, every $U(s)$ commutes with every operator in eMe.

Consequently, for every $s \in \mathbb{R}$, the unitary $U(s) \,|\, eH : eH \to eH$ belongs to the commutant of the reduced von Neumann algebra $\big\{\, x \,|\, eH : eH \to eH\,;\, x \in eMe \,\big\}$, hence to the induced von Neumann algebra $\big\{\, x' \,|\, eH : eH \to eH\,;\, x' \in M' \,\big\}$. Since the kernel of the induction $*$-homomorphism $M' \ni x' \mapsto x' \,|\, eH$ is $M'\big(1_H - z(e)\big)$, where $z(e) \in Z(M)$ stands for the central support of e, there exists a one-parameter group $(u'_s)_{s\in\mathbb{R}}$ of unitaries in $M'z(e)$ such that

$$U(s) \,|\, eH = u'_s \,|\, eH\,, \text{ that is } U(s)\, e = u'_s e\,, \qquad s \in \mathbb{R}\,.$$

Setting $u_s = J_M u'_{-s} J_M$, $(u_s)_{s\in\mathbb{R}}$ is a one-parameter group of unitaries in $Mz(e)$ such that

$$U(s) J_M e J_M = J_M U(-s)\, e J_M = J_M u'_{-s} e J_M = u_s J_M e J_M\,, \qquad s \in \mathbb{R}\,.$$

Therefore we have, for every $s \geq 0$ and $a \in Mz(e)$,

$$\begin{aligned}\gamma_s(a) J_M e J_M &= J_M e J_M U(s)\, a\, U(-s) J_M e J_M = J_M e J_M u_s a u_{-s} J_M e J_M \\ &= (u_s a u_{-s}) J_M e J_M\,.\end{aligned}$$

Since the kernel of the induction $*$-homomorphism $M \ni x \mapsto x \,|\, J_M e J_M H$ is equal to $M\big(1_H - z(J_M e J_M)\big) = M\big(1_H - z(e)\big)$, we obtain that

$$\gamma_s(a) = u_s a u_{-s}\,, \qquad s \geq 0\,,\ a \in Mz(e)\,.$$

In particular, $Nz(e) = \gamma_1\big(Mz(e)\big) = u_1 Mz(e) u_{-1} = Mz(e)$, and so $e \leq z(e) \leq p$.

Proof of (3). Let us assume that $M_{-\infty} = \bigcap\limits_{s\geq 0} \gamma_s(M)$ contains M^φ.

Ad $U(s)$ leaves $M_{-\infty}$ invariant for every $s \in \mathbb{R}$, defining thus an *so*-continuous one-parameter group $(\alpha_s)_{s\in\mathbb{R}}$ of $*$-automorphisms of $M_{-\infty}$. Using Theorem 2.14, we get an injective $b \in M_{-\infty}$, $0 \leq b \leq 1_H$, such that

$$\alpha_s(x) = b^{-is} x\, b^{is}\,, \qquad s \in \mathbb{R}\,,\ x \in M_{-\infty} \tag{8.9}$$

and

$$\left.\begin{array}{l}\sigma \ *\text{-automorphism of } M_{-\infty} \text{ and } \lambda_\sigma > 0 \\ \sigma \circ \alpha_s = \alpha_{\lambda_\sigma s} \circ \sigma \text{ for all } s \in \mathbb{R}\end{array}\right\} \implies \sigma(b) = b^{\lambda_\sigma}\,. \tag{8.10}$$

Since $b \in M_{-\infty}$, (8.9) yields that

$$U(s)\, b\, U(s)^* = \alpha_s(b) = b\,, \text{that is } b \text{ commutes with } U(s)\,, \quad s \in \mathbb{R}\,. \tag{8.11}$$

In particular, $b \in U(1)\, M\, U(1)^* = N$. Furthermore, by (1) in Theorem 2.1 we have

$$\sigma_t^\varphi \circ \gamma_s = \gamma_{e^{-2\pi t} s} \circ \sigma_t^\varphi\,, \qquad s\,,\, t \in \mathbb{R}\,, \tag{8.12}$$

so $M_{-\infty}$ is left invariant by all σ_t^φ. Therefore, applying (8.10) with $\sigma = \sigma_t^\varphi$, we get

$$\sigma_t^\varphi(b) = b^{\,e^{-2\pi t}}, \qquad t \in \mathbb{R}\,. \tag{8.13}$$

Let $\chi_{\{\lambda\}}$ be the characteristic function of $\{\lambda\} \subset \mathbb{R}$. For every $t \in \mathbb{R}$ we have

$$\sigma_t^{\varphi}(b) = b^{\,e^{-2\pi t}} \implies \sigma_t^{\varphi}\big(\chi_{\{1\}}(b)\big) = \chi_{\{1\}}(b)\,,$$

so $\chi_{\{1\}}(b) \in M^{\varphi}$. On the other hand, (8.11) implies that $\chi_{\{1\}}(b)$ commutes with all $U(s)$. Therefore $\chi_{\{1\}}(b) \in N$ commutes with all $\Delta_N^{it} = U(1)\,\Delta_M^{it}U(1)^*$, and so it belongs to N^{ψ}.

Let us denote

$$\begin{aligned}
&e_o = 1_H - \chi_{\{1\}}(b) \in M^{\varphi} \cap N^{\psi}\,,\\
&\varphi_o = \text{the restriction of } \varphi \text{ to } e_o\, M\, e_o\,,\\
&\psi_o = \text{the restriction of } \psi \text{ (hence also of } \varphi) \text{ to } e_o\, N\, e_o\,,\\
&b_o = e_o\, b\, e_o = b\, e_o = e_o\, b \in e_o\, M\, e_o\,.
\end{aligned}$$

By [28], Proposition 4.1 and Theorem 4.6 (see also [33], Propositions 4.5 and 4.7), φ_o is a normal semifinite faithful weight and its modular group is the restriction of the modular group of φ to $e_o\, M\, e_o$. Similarly, ψ_o is a normal semifinite faithful weight and its modular group is the restriction of the modular group of ψ to $e_o\, N\, e_o$. In particular, by (8.13), we have

$$\sigma_t^{\varphi_o}(b_o) = {b_o}^{e^{-2\pi t}}\,, \qquad t \in \mathbb{R}\,. \tag{8.14}$$

Since $0 \leq b_o \leq e_o$ and the supports of both b_o and $e_o - b_o$ are equal to the unit e_o of $e_o\, M\, e_o$, $-\log b_o$ is a positive selfadjoint linear operator, of support e_o and affiliated with $e_o\, M\, e_o$. Consequently, defining

$$u_s = (-\log b_o)^{is}\,, \qquad s \in \mathbb{R}\,,$$

$(u_s)_{s\in\mathbb{R}}$ is a strongly continuous one-parameter group of unitaries in $e_o\, M\, e_o$ and (8.14) yields

$$\sigma_t^{\varphi_o}(u_s) = e^{-2\pi tsi}\, u_s\,, \qquad s\,,\, t \in \mathbb{R}\,.$$

Now the characterization theorem of M. Landstad [23], Theorem 2 (see also [34], Theorems I.3.3 and I.3.4, or [33], Theorem 19.9) implies that the von Neumann algebra $e_o\, M\, e_o$ is generated by $(e_o\, M\, e_o)^{\varphi_o} = e_o\, M^{\varphi} e_o$ and by $u_{\mathbb{R}}$, that is

$$e_o\, M^{\varphi} e_o \text{ and } b_o \text{ generate the von Neumann algebra } e_o\, M\, e_o\,. \tag{8.15}$$

Since $M^{\varphi} \subset M_{-\infty}$ and $b \in M_{-\infty}$, we get that $e_o\, M\, e_o \subset M_{-\infty} \subset \gamma_1(M) = N$, that is $e_o\, M\, e_o = e_o\, N\, e_o$. Consequently $\varphi_o = \psi_o$, and so the modular groups σ^{φ} and σ^{ψ} have the same restriction $\sigma^{\varphi_o} = \sigma^{\psi_o}$ on $e_o\, M\, e_o = e_o\, N\, e_o$. Using (3) in Theorem 2.1, we obtain for every $x \in e_o\, M^{\varphi}\, e_o \subset M^{\varphi} \cap N^{\psi}$ and $t \in \mathbb{R}$:

$$U(1-e^{2\pi t})\, x\, U(1-e^{2\pi t})^* = \Delta_N^{-it}\Delta_M^{it}\, x\, \Delta_M^{-it}\Delta_N^{it} = \Delta_N^{-it}\, \sigma_t^{\varphi}(x)\, \Delta_N^{it} = \sigma_{-t}^{\psi}(x) = x\,.$$

Therefore $e_o\, M^{\varphi} e_o \subset \big\{x \in M\,;\, U(s)\, x = x\, U(s)\,,\, s \in \mathbb{R}\big\}$, which yields together with (8.11) and (8.15) :

$$e_o\, M\, e_o \subset \big\{x \in M\,;\, U(s)\, x = x\, U(s)\,,\, s \in \mathbb{R}\big\}\,.$$

In other words, every α_s acts identically on $e_o\, M\, e_o \subset M_{-\infty}$. By (8.9) we conclude that b_o belongs to the center of $e_o\, M\, e_o$.

Since $b_o \in Z(e_o\, M\, e_o)$ is invariant under the modular automorphism group of φ_o, which coincides with the restriction of the modular automorphism group of φ to $e_o\, M\, e_o$ as discussed above, we have $b_o \in M^{\varphi}$. Taking into account (8.14), we obtain

$$b^{\,e^{-2\pi t}} e_o = {b_o}^{e^{-2\pi t}} = \sigma_t^{\varphi}(b_o) = b_o = b\, e_o\,, \qquad t \in \mathbb{R}\,,$$

which is possible only if $e_o = 0$. Consequently $\chi_{\{1\}}(b) = 1_H$, that is $b = 1_H$. But then every $\alpha_s = \mathrm{Ad}\, U(s) \,|\, M_{-\infty}$ acts identically on $M_{-\infty}$, hence

$$M_{-\infty} \subset \big\{x \in M\,;\, U(s)\,x = x\,U(s)\,,\ s \in \mathbb{R}\big\} = \big\{x \in M\,;\, \gamma_s(x) = x\,,\ s \geq 0\big\}\,.$$

Proof of (4). Let us first assume that $\overline{\mathfrak{M}_\varphi \cap M^\varphi}^{\,so} = M^\varphi$. Taking into account (8) in Theorem 2.1, the inclusion $M^\varphi \subset \big\{x \in M\,;\, \gamma_s(x) = x\,,\ s \geq 0\big\}$ will follow once we show that

$$s > 0\,,\ x \in \mathfrak{M}_\varphi \cap M^\varphi \implies U(s)\,x_\varphi = x_\varphi\,.$$

For let $s > 0$ and $x \in \mathfrak{M}_\varphi \cap M^\varphi$ be arbitrary. Using (8) in Theorem 2.1, (2.3) and (8.12), we get successively

$$\Delta_M^{it}\,U(s)\,x_\varphi = \sigma_t^\varphi\big(\gamma_s(x)\big)_\varphi = \gamma_{e^{-2\pi t}s}\big(x\big)_\varphi = U(e^{-2\pi t}s)\,x_\varphi \xrightarrow{t\to+\infty} x_\varphi\,,$$

$$\|\,U(s)\,x_\varphi - x_\varphi\| = \|\,\Delta_M^{it}\big(U(s)\,x_\varphi - x_\varphi\big)\| = \|\,\Delta_M^{it}\,U(s)\,x_\varphi - \sigma_t^\varphi(x)_\varphi\| \xrightarrow{t\to+\infty} 0\,.$$

For the second implication we prove that if

$$M^\varphi \subset \big\{x \in M\,;\, \gamma_s(x) = x\,,\ s \geq 0\big\} \tag{8.16}$$

and $p \neq 1_H$, then $M(1_H - p)$ is of type III_1. Then also $N(1_H - p) = \gamma_1\big(M(1_H - p))\big)$ will be of type III_1.

Taking into account (2.11), we have to prove that

$$e \in M^\varphi \text{ projection, } 0 \neq e \leq 1_H - p \implies \sigma\big(\,\Delta_M \,|\, eJ_MeJ_MH\,\big) = [\,0, +\infty)\,.$$

For this purpose, let the projection $e \in M^\varphi$, $0 \neq e \leq 1_H - p$, be arbitrary. By the assumption (8.16) we have $\gamma_s(e) = e$ for all $s \geq 0$, hence (8.7) holds. Since $0 \neq e \leq 1_H - p$, the above proved (2) entails that (8.8) does not hold, that is $U(s)\,eJ_MeJ_M \neq eJ_MeJ_M$ for some $s \in \mathbb{R}$. Nevertheless, by (8.7) and by (2) in Theorem 2.1, all $U(s)$ commute with eJ_MeJ_M. Since $e \in M^\varphi$, also every Δ_M^{it} commutes with eJ_MeJ_M.

According to (2.21), $U(i) = \exp(-P) \in B(H)$ is injective and $0 \leq U(i) \leq 1_H$. By the commutation relation (1) in Theorem 2.1, we have

$$\Delta_M^{it}\,U(i)\,\Delta_M^{-it} = U(i)^{\,e^{-2\pi t}}, \qquad t \in \mathbb{R}\,. \tag{8.17}$$

Consequently, the spectral projection $f_o = \chi_{\{1\}}\big(U(i)\big)$ commutes with every Δ_M^{it}. On the other hand, f_o clearly commutes with every $U(s)$. Finally, the commutation of eJ_MeJ_M with all $U(s)$ implies that the projections eJ_MeJ_M and f_o commute.

We have already seen that $U(s)\,eJ_MeJ_M \neq eJ_MeJ_M$ for some $s \in \mathbb{R}$. On the other hand, since $U(s) = U(i)^{-is}$, we have $U(s)\,f_o = f_o$ for every $s \in \mathbb{R}$. Therefore $eJ_MeJ_M \not\leq f_o$, and so the projection

$$f_1 = eJ_MeJ_M - f_oeJ_MeJ_M \leq eJ_MeJ_M$$

is not zero. Since all Δ_M^{it} and all $U(s)$ commute with eJ_MeJ_M and with f_o, they commute also with f_1. Therefore, we can define an *so*-continuous one-parameter group $(v_t)_{t\in\mathbb{R}}$ of unitaries on f_1H by setting

$$v_t = \Delta_M^{it} \,|\, f_1H = (\Delta_M \,|\, f_1H)^{it}\,. \qquad t \in \mathbb{R}\,, \tag{8.18}$$

as well as the operator

$$b_1 = U(i) \,|\, f_1H : f_1H \longrightarrow f_1H \in B(f_1H)\,,$$

for which $0 \leq b_1 \leq f_1$ and $b_1 \, , f_1 - b_1$ are injective. From (8.17) we get successively

$$v_t \, b_1 v_t^* = b_1^{e^{-2\pi t}} , \qquad t \in \mathbb{R} \, ,$$

$$v_t \, (-\log b_1)^{is} v_t^* = e^{-2\pi tsi} \, (-\log b_1)^{is} \, , \qquad t \, , \, s \in \mathbb{R} \, .$$

Now the Stone-von Neumann Uniqueness Theorem for canonical commutation relations (see e.g. [2], Ch. 20, § 2 or [32]) entails that there exist a Hilbert space $K \neq \{0\}$ and a unitary operator

$$W : K \overline{\otimes} L^2(\mathbb{R}) \longrightarrow f_1 H$$

such that

$$v_t = W \circ (1_K \overline{\otimes} \, m_{-2\pi t}) \circ W^* \, , \ (-\log b_1)^{is} = W \circ (1_K \overline{\otimes} \, \lambda_s) \circ W^* \, , \qquad t \, , \, s \in \mathbb{R} \, ,$$

where

$$m_t \text{ is the multiplication operator with } e^{it \, \cdot} \text{ on } L^2(\mathbb{R}) \, , \qquad t \in \mathbb{R} \, ,$$

$$\lambda_s \text{ is the translation operator } \xi \longmapsto \xi(\, \cdot \, - s) \text{ on } L^2(\mathbb{R}) \, , \qquad s \in \mathbb{R} \, .$$

Using (8.18), we deduce that $\Delta_M \, | \, f_1 H = W \circ (1_K \overline{\otimes} \, m_{2\pi i}) \circ W^*$, where $m_{2\pi i}$ is the unbounded positive selfadjoint multiplication operator with $e^{-2\pi \, \cdot}$ in $L^2(\mathbb{R})$. Consequently, the spectrum of $\Delta_M \, | \, f_1 H$ is equal to the spectrum of $1_K \overline{\otimes} \, m_{2\pi i}$, that is to $[0, +\infty)$. Since $f_1 \leq e J_M e J_M$, we conclude that also the spectrum of $\Delta_M \, | \, e J_M e J_M H$ is equal to $[0, +\infty)$.

□

References

[1] W. Arveson: On groups of automorphisms of operator algebras, *J. Funct. Analysis* **15** (1974), 217-243

[2] A. O. Barut, R. Raczka: *Theory of Group Representations and Applications*, Polish Scientific Publishers, Warszawa, 1977

[3] C. A. Berenstein, R. Gay: *Complex Variables, An Introduction*, Springer-Verlag, 1991

[4] J. Bisognano, E. Wichmann: On the duality condition for a Hermitian scalar field, *J. Math. Phys.* **16** (1975), 985-1007

[5] H. J. Borchers: Energy and momentum as observables in quantum field theory, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **2** (1966), 49-54

[6] H. J. Borchers: The CPT-theorem in two-dimensional theories of local observables, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **143** (1992), 315-332

[7] H. J. Borchers: On the use of modular groups in quantum field theory, *Ann. Inst. Henri Poincaré - Physique Théorique* **63** (1995), 331-382

[8] H. J. Borchers: Tensor product decompositions in Quantum Field Theory, *Oberwolfach lectures*, March 1997

[9] H. J. Borchers: Half-Sided Translations and the Type of von Neumann Algebras, *Lett. Math. Phys.* **44** (1998), 283-290

[10] H. J. Borchers, J. Yngvason: Modular groups of quantum fields in thermal states, *J. Math. Phys.* **40** (1999), 601-624

[11] H. Cartan: *Théorie élémentaire des fonctions analytiques d'une ou plusieurs variables complexes*, Hermann, Paris, 1961

[12] I. Ciorănescu, L. Zsidó: Analytic generators for one-parameter groups, *Tôhoku Math. J.* **28** (1976), 327-362

[13] A. Connes: Une classification des facteurs de type III, *Ann. Sci. École Norm. Sup.* **6** (1973), 133-252

[14] J. B. Conway: *Functions of one complex variable II.*, Springer-Verlag, 1995

[15] D. R. Davidson: Endomorphism semigroups and lightlike translations, *Lett. Math. Phys.* **38** (1996), 77-90

[16] J. Dixmier, P. Malliavin: Factorizations de fonctions et de vecteurs indéfiniment différentiables, *Bull. Sci. Math.* (2) **102** (1978), 307-330

[17] M. Florig: On Borchers' Theorem, *Lett. Math. Phys.* **46** (1998), 289-293

[18] R. C. Gunning, H. Rossi: *Analytic Functions of Several Complex Variables*, Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, N. J., 1965

[19] U. Haagerup: The standard form of von Neumann algebras, *Math. Scand.* **37** (1975), 271-283

[20] K. Hoffman: *Banach Spaces of Analytic Functions*, Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, N. J., 1962

[21] P. Koosis: *Introduction to H_p Spaces*, Cambridge University Press, 1980

[22] H. Kosaki: *Type III Factors and Index Theory*, Lecture Note Series, 43, Seoul National University, Global Analysis Research Centre, Seoul, 1998

[23] M. Landstad: Duality theory for covariant systems, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **248** (1979), 223-276

[24] R. Longo: Solution of the factorial Stone-Weierstrass conjecture, *Inv. Math.* **76** (1986), 145-155

[25] R. Longo: Simple injective subfactors, *Adv. Math.* **63** (1987), 152-171

[26] R. Longo: Index of subfactors and statistics of quantum fields I, II, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **126** (1989), 217-247 and **130** (1990), 285-309

[27] G. K. Pedersen: *C^*-Algebras and their Automorphism Groups*, Academic Press, 1979

[28] G. K. Pedersen, M. Takesaki: The Radon-Nikodym theorem for von Neumann algebras, *Acta Math.* **130** (1973), 53-88

[29] M.A. Rieffel, A. Van Daele: The Commutation Theorem for Tensor Products of von Neumann Algebras, *Bull. London Math. Soc.*, **7** (1975), 257-260

[30] K. Schmüdgen: *Unbounded Operator Algebras and Representation Theory*, Operator Theory: Advances and Applications, Vol. 37, Birkhäuser Verlag, 1990

[31] B. Schroer: Recent developments of algebraic methods in quantum field theories, *Intern. J. Modern Phys. B*, **6** (1992), 2041-2059

[32] J. Slawny: On factor representations and the C^*-algebra of canonical commutation relations, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **24** (1972), 151-170

[33] Ş. Strătilă: *Modular Theory in Operator Algebras*, Editura Academiei - Abacus Press, 1981

[34] Ş. Strătilă, D. V. Voiculescu, L. Zsidó: On crossed products, I, II, *Revue Roum. Math. Pures Appl.*, **21** (1976), 1411-1449 ; **22** (1977), 83-117

[35] Ş. Strătilă, L. Zsidó: *Lectures on von Neumann Algebras*, Editura Academiei - Abacus Press, 1979

[36] M. Takesaki: *Tomita's Theory of Modular Hilbert Algebras and its Applications*, Lecture Notes in Math., 128, Springer-Verlag, 1970

[37] H.-W. Wiesbrock: Half-sided modular inclusions of von Neumann algebras, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **157** (1993), 83-92

[38] H.-W. Wiesbrock: Symmetries and half-sided modular inclusions of von Neumann algebras, *Lett. Math. Phys.* **28** (1993), 107-114

[39] H.-W. Wiesbrock: Conformal quantum field theory and half-sided modular inclusions of von Neumann algebras, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **158** (1993), 537-543

[40] H.-W. Wiesbrock: A note on strongly additive conformal field theory and half-sided modular conformal standard inclusions, *Lett. Math. Phys.* **31** (1994), 303-307

[41] H.-W. Wiesbrock: Superselection structure and localized Connes' cocycles, *Rev. Math. Phys.* **7** (1995), 133-160

[42] H.-W. Wiesbrock: Erratum: "Half-sided modular inclusions of von Neumann algebras" [Commun. Math. Phys. **157** (1993), 83-92], *Commun. Math. Phys.* **184** (1997), 683-685

[43] L. Zsidó: Analytic generator and the foundation of the Tomita-Takesaki theory of Hilbert algebras, in "Proc. International School Math. Phys.", Univ. Camerino, 1974, 182-267

[44] L. Zsidó: Spectral and ergodic properties of the analytic generator, *J. Approximation Theory* **20** (1977), 77-138

[45] L. Zsidó: On the equality of two weights, *Revue Roum. Math. Pures Appl.* **23** (1978), 631-646

Research Institute for Mathematical Sciences, Kyoto University, Sakyoku, Kyoto 606-8205, Japan
E-mail address: `araki@kurims.kyoto-u.ac.jp`

Department of Mathematics, University of Rome "Tor Vergata", Via della Ricerca Scientifica, 00133 Rome, Italy
E-mail address: `zsido@axp.mat.uniroma2.it`